BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

PURCHASED WITH THE INCOME OF THE FUND
GIVEN BY

FREDERICK MADGE
1820-1908

SON OF THE REV. THOS. MADGE, 1786-1870, OF
ESSEX STREET CHAPEL, LONDON, 1825-1859

Vols IV & V
in 1 Vol
3/

M b 22

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."—JOHN xvii. 3.

VOLUME IV.

FEBRUARY, 1865—JANUARY, 1866.

BELFAST:

UNITARIAN DEPOSITORY, 45, ARTHUR STREET.

LONDON: WHITFIELD, GREEN, & SON, STRAND.

1866.

BELFAST:
PRINTED BY ALEX. MAYNE,
HIGH STREET.

X788.4
Cu89 v.4

CONTENTS.

FEBRUARY.

PAGE
Our Magazine, ... 1
Anti-Supernaturalism in the Pulpit, ... 2
Narratives from Real Life, ... 11
Congregational Memoirs—Raloo, ... 15
The American Unitarian Association, ... 22
Poetry—"Thou, God, Seest Me," 10. How to Live, ... 25
Review—Reform of the Church of Scotland in Worship, &c., ... 26
Intelligence, ... 30—34

MARCH.

The Presbytery of Antrim with its Test and No Test, ... 3^7
Anti-Supernaturalism in the Pulpit, ... 4^4
Congregational Memoirs—Raloo, ... 5^2
Narratives from Real Life, ... 5^7
Poetry—God's Anvil, ... 5^1
Review—Reform of the Church of Scotland in Worship, &c., ... 6^1
Intelligence, ... 67—71

APRIL.

Life in the American Unitarian Church, ... 73
Congregational Memoirs—Raloo, ... 78
The Christian Miracles, ... 85
Narratives from Real Life, ... 88
Loyalty to Christ, ... 93
Free Prayer *versus* Forms of Prayer, ... 97
Mr. Joseph Barker and the Unitarian Denomination, ... 100
Adelaide Unitarian Church, ... 102
Poetry—A Search for Peace, ... 83
Intelligence, ... 103—108

MAY.

On Fellowship between those who Differ about Miracles, ... 109
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle, ... 115
Communion Thoughts, ... 122
Narratives from Real Life, ... 125
Free Prayer *versus* Forms of Prayer, ... 128
Poetry—Trust in God, ... 114
Correspondence, ... 132—135
Intelligence, ... 136—144

JUNE.

The American National Unitarian Convention, ... 145
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle, ... 150
Thoughts on the Form and Manner of Public Worship, ... 155
Narratives from Real Life, ... 162
Poetry—The Last Sleep, ... 148
Intelligence, ... 167—180

JULY.

What is Unitarianism? 181
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle (*continued*), ... 190
Narratives from Real Life, ... 197
Thoughts on the Form and Manner of Public Worship, ... 200
Poetry—The Eternal Goodness, 187. Lines written on the late Refreshing Rain, ... 208
Intelligence, ... 209—216

7311

AUGUST.

	PAGE
British and Foreign Unitarian Association,	217
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle (*continued*),	223
The Primary and Distinctive Office and Work of the Christian Ministry,	231
Narratives from Real Life,	240
A Mother's Influence,	242
Four New Axioms,	243
An Important Admission,	244
POETRY—The Narrow Way,	230
INTELLIGENCE,	245—249

SEPTEMBER.

Our Pulpits—How are they to be Filled?	253
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle (*continued*),	260
Progress of Non-Subscription to Creeds in the Churches of Scotland and England,	267
The Graves of the Young,	272
Address to the Members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association,	277
Letter from the Rev. J. P. Hopps,	281
POETRY—The Little Candle,	252
INTELLIGENCE,	283—287

OCTOBER.

A Step Farther,	289
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle (*continued*),	294
The Gospel in the Life of Christ,	302
Inclusive or Exclusive?	307
The Relation of Miracles to Christianity,	316
Annual Report of General Baptist Churches,	322
POETRY—Bearing the Cross,	309
INTELLIGENCE,	323, 324

NOVEMBER.

A Retrograde Proposal,	325
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle (*continued*),	332
A Challenge Accepted,	338
The Gospel in the Words of Christ,	344
Some Editorial Errors Corrected,	349
Exclusives and Inclusives,	352
POETRY—Life,	331
INTELLIGENCE,	353, 354

DECEMBER.

Go A-Head!	361
Congregational Memoirs—Cairncastle (*continued*),	366
The Gospel in the Cross of Christ,	376
Rev. J. Martineau's Reply to "A Challenge Accepted,"	383
Additional Queries on Exclusives and Inclusives,	386
The Porter and Bagot Discussion,	387
POETRY—One by One,	382
INTELLIGENCE,	388—395

JANUARY.

The Spirit of the Life of Christ,	397
Reply to Mr. Martineau's Criticism on "A Challenge Accepted,"	403
The Thorn in the Flesh,	414
POETRY—The Last Good Night,	401
INTELLIGENCE,	420

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] FEBRUARY, 1865. [No. 1.

OUR MAGAZINE.

WE enter this month on the Fourth Volume of our humble magazine, no less convinced than in the past years of the need of such an organ, and no less anxious to render it worthy of the important principles which it aims at vindicating and extending. When it was first commenced, its name was severely criticised, and plausible arguments were adduced to show that it was unmeaning, and even ungrammatical; but experience has painfully proved that many profess to be members, and some even ministers, of the Unitarian Church, who acknowledge no faith either in a Christ or in a Divine Revelation. In opposition to views so loose, though bearing the honoured name of Unitarian, we desire to plead for *Christian* Unitarianism; and while there is scarcely one professedly Unitarian journal in these countries that does not at times utter an uncertain sound on the great question of Divine Revelation, there is certainly room for a magazine which aims at upholding the authority of Revelation, and maintaining the principles of Unitarianism as they are contained in the Holy Scriptures.

It has sometimes been unreasonably objected, that in the pages of *The Christian Unitarian* we do not publish articles on both sides of a controversial subject. We advocate the freest inquiry, and oppose everything in the form of penalty or persecution for opinions, however erroneous or even pernicious we may believe them to be; but we do not pretend to be the organ of all parties. If any think we err in our Unitarian views of God and Christ, and if they believe in the Trinity of the Godhead and in the Deity of the Saviour, they have a right to hold such views, and there is no want of organs through which

they may advocate them. If there are those who think that the Scriptures have no more authority than the Koran or the Vedas, and who regard Jesus as simply a man of genius and goodness, and nothing more, there are organs through which they, too, may propagate their rationalistic and chilling doctrines. Our province is, to plead for the right of all to hold and profess whatever views of God and duty they believe to be true, but at the same time to advocate those principles and opinions which we prize as God's truth, and to do what we can to extend them.

It is quite possible to hold firmly and advocate earnestly the views of Christian doctrine we profess, without expressing one unkind sentiment towards those who differ from us, or allowing fidelity to our principles to interfere with the courtesies and charities of life. As we do not imagine that those only who hold our opinions can be saved, we have no apology for the bitterness and bigotry that so often characterise what are, by a strange misnomer, styled the *Evangelical* sects; but as we believe that our principles are calculated to impart light to the erring, to bring strength to the tempted, to minister consolation to the mourning and suffering, and to kindle hopes full of immortality in the dying, we are animated with an earnest desire to spread them, and to this important object our magazine is devoted. That it will meet with the continued support of Christian Unitarians we cannot doubt.

ANTI-SUPERNATURALISM IN THE PULPIT.

[The following is an Address recently delivered to the Graduating Class of the Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, by the Rev. Frederic H. Hedge, D.D. The views which it advocates are so important, especially at the present time, that we are glad to have an opportunity of publishing it in our pages.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

The intellectual life of this century, so stimulating and so productive in every department of science and the useful arts, has operated with very different effect in the province of religion. Its influence there has been a dis-

turbing and destructive force. I speak of religion as a system of doctrine, of ecclesiastical tradition, of Scriptural authority, not as a principle of spiritual life. Religion as a system of beliefs, intellectually apprehended, has gained nothing with the progress of the time. A pregnant intimation that the speculative intellect is not the source of religious truth.

In the sphere of science the mind has acted with positive and creative energy, extending the domain of knowledge and of use beyond all former precedent. In the sphere of religion its action has been negative or limitary. To the question, What has science gained from modern investigation and experiment? its disciples answer triumphantly with steam-power, and photography, and electro-magnetism, and a hundred significant discoveries. What answer shall we make when asked for positive results in theology? Shall we point to the saints of Utah with their wives? or to Sunday conventicles of "Spiritualists" addressed by preachers in a "trance-state"? For doctrinal discoveries shall we refer to the latest Council of the Church of Rome and the "Bulla Ineffabilis," the grand achievement of Pius IX., at whose instigation the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of Jesus, rejected by the wisdom of the thirteenth century, has been established for the edification of the nineteenth? Or must we not rather confess that the real discoveries, the genuine results, of theological inquiry have been negative,—discoveries of error and limitation,—that the books of the Pentateuch are not the work of Moses and are not historically correct, that the Tripersonality of the Godhead is not taught in the Bible, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are not infallible in matters of fact?

I do not question the truth of these discoveries; I do not deny their critical value. I do but declare their purport and bearing. I emphasize the fact of this negative tendency in theology.

The question here is not of progress, but a question of continued existence,—a question of life or death. How far will the process of elimination, initiated some hundred years since, extend? Will the criticism which has taken so much, leave anything remaining? Will negation stop

short of universal rejection, not only of all Christian, but of all religious ideas and beliefs ?

This is the question which perplexes the conservative mind, more impressed with the negative character than edified by the critical gains of recent Biblical investigation. The conservative mind is easily alarmed at any invasion of the sacred domain of faith, well knowing its incomstate a religious idea that has lost its hold of the popular petence to reproduce a perished sanctity, or to reinmind.

But let conservatism comfort itself with the thought that nothing in human nature is so indestructible as religion. Its field and aspects may change, but the principle is a fixed star in the human constitution. It may suffer temporary eclipse, but it will beam again, and resume its place of command, and recover its ancient rights. Truth, moreover, has its own divinely appointed and therefore divinely assured destination, which no criticism can countervail, but must eventually serve and promote. "For we can do nothing against the truth but for the truth." To fancy that the future of religion can be seriously compromised by criticism, however radical, is to doubt its divine origin. If its origin is divine, the divine rule is charged with its fortunes, and its future is sure. "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought, but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." What a sequel and summing up of the history of Christianity would that be, to say that "God sent his Son into the world," "that the world through him might be saved," but the Tübingen School and British "Essays and Reviews" defeated that purpose, and it had to be abandoned ?

The cause of traditional belief and the cause of faith are not necessarily identical. There was all the traditional belief of England in the Oxford Declaration, signed by eleven thousand of her clergy, protesting against the recent decision of the Court of Arches ; but I think there was less of faith in it than in the writings of the Essayists and Reviewers which provoked it. The committee of three hundred who presented this Declaration to the Archbishop of Canterbury express their fervent joy that so many of the clergy have given their assent

to the doctrine, "that the Bible not only contains, but is the Word of God, and that the punishment of the cursed is everlasting;" and thus "they have been enabled to promote the glory of our Lord." Without irreverence, it may be questioned whether our Lord regards with greater complacency the zeal which would limit his truth and mercy in the interest of the letter of Scripture, or the thoughtful inquiry which seeks the truth by aid of the light which lighteth all who come into the world. It is a melancholy, nay, desperate view of human and divine things, which supposes God's truth to be at the mercy of man's caprice. The shallow conservative who fears that the speculative minds of the nineteenth century will undermine Christianity, exhibits as great a want of faith as the shallow anti-supernaturalist who fancies that the speculative minds of the first century created it. I can see no difference between the two; the one is as much an unbeliever as the other.

Nevertheless, it must be confessed that the negative spirit in theology has been in our time disproportionately active. I cannot regret the critical labours of even the most radical theologians. I cannot regret the results of those labours, so far as they are warranted by competent learning, by scientific method, by conscientious investigation. I regret no abatement of the letter or canonicity or infallibility of Scripture thus obtained. What I do regret is, that an equal amount of intellectual ability and scientific insight has not been found for the elucidation and restatement, in forms corresponding to the thought and culture of our time, of the spiritual truths represented in other obsolete forms by the Scripture and the Church. I regret the divorce between the intellectual life of the age and its religion. I regret that minds of the first order in this century, with rare exceptions, if engaged in theology at all, have come to it in a negative instead of a positive mood, and have spent their labour on the letter instead of the spirit.

Christianity has nothing to fear from criticism. Nevertheless, it should be understood that, whilst there is a criticism which is quite legitimate, whatever may be destroyed by it, there is also a criticism which is not legitimate,—not because it is destructive, but because it

misakes its method and its objects, and applies its market scale to matters which are incommensurable. The one is a criticism of authors and of books, the other of ideas and beliefs,—a criticism of the letter and a criticism of the spirit. Take an analogy from ancient literature. Suppose you could disprove the genuineness of the Phædon, or of any Greek or Latin work of high repute which treats of the immortality of the soul,—or, admitting their genuineness, suppose you could refute (which would not be difficult) the arguments employed in those writings,—would that settle the question of Immortality? Independently of the Christian revelation and all other revelation, if these were the only books which treat of the subject, would their inadequacy settle the question? The books may be spurious, the reasoning poor, but the doctrine of Immortality is independent of literature and logic. I never read a treatise of the many that undertake to demonstrate the being of God, which did not seem to me very inconclusive,—more apt to raise doubts than to lay them. But the truth of theism is nowise impaired by the weakness of the arguments adduced in its support. So in Christian theology, it is one thing to set aside books, to prove them spurious, to point out flaws in the reasoning and testimony of the writers; and quite another thing to reject the ideas or the facts represented and attested by them. Prove, if you can, that the fourth Gospel is not an Apostolic, but a later production, that its doctrine had been anticipated by an Alexandrine Jew; it would not follow that the doctrine is not true, or the writing uninspired. It is truth that makes inspiration, not inspiration truth. Disprove the validity, as testimony admissible in a court of law, of all the statements in the New testament concerning the resurrection of Christ; the fact itself is not therefore disproved. The fact is beyond that kind of criticism. We may hold, with Hume, that a miracle is insusceptible of demonstration, and we may see good reason for not believing in this or that particular miracle, in the form in which it is presented in the record. But to treat all miracle as fable, to rule out of the record whatever contradicts the ordinary course of human experience, retaining the rest, or to set aside the whole as unhistorical because of this element in it, is

merely wilful, and as unphilosophic in principle as it is contrary to sound criticism.

I am well aware of the difference between historical and abstract truth, and am far from placing the immortality of the soul, or the being of God, on the same ground with the miracles and resurrection of Christ. The analogy touches the one point only of indemonstrableness. I maintain that defective evidence and imperfect demonstration are not conclusive against doctrine or fact.

The truth of the evangelic history rests on different evidence, and carries a different degree of certitude, from that which belongs to the primary truths of religion. But these are no more impregnable than those, if scepticism happens to call them in question. It is prejudice or arbitrary partiality, not logical necessity, that causes denial to stop with the Gospel. Mr. Theodore Parker, whose honest and abounding zeal was early enlisted on the negative side, and with whom impatience of dogmatic authority and ecclesiastical tradition became a controlling principle of thought, could see no exceptional quality in Christ, but remained to the last a devout theist. His Sermons on Theism have been pronounced the least able of his productions. They suggest the suspicion that unconsciously the stout reformer was held to this belief by the want of a resting-place and base of operations as a controversialist and preacher, rather than by intellectual conviction; that his theism was not a philosophic apperception, but a moral determination, with as much of will and of taking for granted in it as in most men's Christianity.

An English disciple of Mr. Parker, in a recent publication, in which she criticises the theological position of different ecclesiastical parties in England, and in which an uncompromising radicalism is graciously relieved by a deep and tender piety, rejects historical Christianity as obsolete traditionalism, whilst she sweetly invites the religious sentiment of the nation to rally around Theism, —that being, in the estimation of the writer, an inexpugnable fortress, because a universal intuition of the soul. The unsuspecting confidence with which she cherishes this position, the innocent unconsciousness of any

possible undermining of this stronghold, the exhortation to Theists to pray as Christians do, the regretful wonder at their neglect so to do, are very touching. Yes! if Theism would but pray and be a religion! If, when the Christ is taken out of it, Christianity would but remain, how "nice" it would be! The Cathedral of St. Paul's might then become a church of "Intuitive Morals," and Westminster Abbey a chapel of Pure Reason; as Agrippa's Pantheon became the St. Mary and Martyrs' Church of Christian Rome.

Strange, that the fact of a prayerless Theism should not have suggested a doubt whether Theism could ever become a rallying-point of popular religion, or whether the religious sentiment could ever change its relation from that of guardian to that of ward. The religious sentiment embodied in traditional religion has been the guardian of Theism hitherto; and, should popular religion fail, so far from affording protection in its turn, it is doubtful if Theism itself would survive.

The fact is, Theism is also a tradition, and not, as is claimed, a universal intuition of the soul. It is no more a universal intuition than the Holy Ghost is a universal intuition, than miraculous mediation is a universal intuition. It is the intuition of such souls only as happen to come within the range of that particular pencil of light with which Hebrew tradition has streaked the world's history. The largest portion of the human family have always been, and are still, without that illumination and without that idea; and he who fancies that outside of this historic beam he would have had the idea of God which he now has, confounds traditional experience with original intuition.

I will not say that absolutely there is no revelation of God which is not historical. Here and there, in cases of exceptional intelligence or exceptional holiness, individuals have attained to a theism independent of Semitic tradition; for there is a "light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." But scarcely in one of a hundred million does this light suffice to show the God of the monotheistic religions. The idea of one only God, self-existent, almighty, wise, and good, Creator and Father of all, is a Hebrew tradition. The conceptions

which stimulate this idea in other faiths will be found, on closer inspection, to have but little affinity with it.

On the whole, the belief in a personal, sole God, so essential to human well-being, is committed to the charge and trust of historical religion. I do not believe it is capable of any social embodiment, of any organized existence, of any existence at all, except as a rare and fitful experience of the private soul, independently of that tutelage. The speculative intellect, uncontrolled by religious faith, unquickened by moral sentiment, the intellect in its own unbiassed action, does not necessarily —I think I may say does not readily—incline to that belief. Science, if I rightly interpret its recent voices, is less and less disposed to adopt it as the best solution of the problem of creation. On the contrary, I suspect that, of those who have lapsed from the faith in historical religion, the majority are atheists. "Our cultivated men," said an eminent and not illiberal German to me some seventeen years since, speaking of the prospects of the nation just before the revolution of 1848,—"our cultivated men have lost the consciousness of God." The augury which he drew for the future of Germany from that circumstance was not a favourable one.

Whether science in some future development may not to some extent supply the place of popular religious ministrations, is a question I shall not discuss. The thing is conceivable only on condition that science shall have reached the same certainty in matters pertaining to the social and moral well-being of man to which she has arrived in astronomy and chemistry,—that the laws of the soul and of human relations shall be as well understood as the laws of elemental structure and mechanical motion. But whether philosophic Theism or Intuitive Morals can ever supply the place of religion, is a question on which I, for one, have no doubt whatever. The first and most essential requisite in popular doctrinal ministration, in any preached Gospel, Christian or not Christian, is authority. And authority sufficient for such ministration is derivable only from one of two sources,—a supposed Divine communication from whose record the preacher draws; or, failing that, unquestionable and unquestioned scientific certainty. In concrete terms, the

Bible or the mathematics. Personal authority, the authority of the individual preacher for those whom he addresses, is something. When reinforced by character, ability, and long experience, it is much. But that personal authority is based on the supposition of some other, ulterior authority, on which the preacher rests and whose exponent he is. Take away that, and, with all his weight of character, his authority would shrink perceptibly. The authority of a young man just entering the ministry, who shall be understood to speak from no warrant but his private opinion, with only his own talent or his own conceit to back him, cannot be exactly measured, but we are safe in placing it somewhere in the neighbourhood of zero.

(*To be continued.*)

"THOU GOD SEEST ME."—Gen. xvi. 13.

[ORIGINAL.]

Thou seest us!—Almighty Love,
Thy sleepless eye is ever near;
Where'er our devious footsteps move,
Thy voice is murmuring in our ear.

Thou seest all!—No secret place
Availeth us to hide from thee;
From human gaze we veil the face;
From human watchfulness we flee.

Thou seest all!—No cherished thought,
Unknown to thee, can dwell within:
Visions from depths of memory brought,
Whispers of joys we strive to win.

Thou seest all!—the embryo dream
Belonging to some future hour,
The anxious care, the worldly scheme—
The bud, perchance, of noxious flower.

Thou seest all!—The world may gaze,
Unconscious of the "dark within;"
We win its love, and earn its praise,
While hearts are flowing o'er with sin.

An awful thought,—no earth-born child,
When infancy's brief hour hath sped,
Can offer worship, undefiled
By selfish care or trembling dread.

Oh, might we trust, like those of old,
By thy dear Son securely led,
No longer should our love be cold,
No longer should our faith be dead.

To thy all-searching eye we bend,
In deep humility we pray—
O God! our Father and our Friend,
Be thou our Guardian, Guide, and Stay.

M.

NARRATIVES FROM REAL LIFE.

[Through the kindness of an able and earnest minister of our faith in the sister kingdom, we hope to publish, in consecutive numbers of *The Christian Unitarian*, a series of papers, of which the following is the first. They are, as their title indicates, *Narratives from Real Life*, although, for various reasons, the names of persons and places are withheld.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

BE NOT DISCOURAGED.

At the close of the year 18—, I was awakened one morning about two o'clock by a knocking at my door, and, on my rising to ascertain the cause, I found a young man and woman, who wished me to visit their uncle, Silas W——, an aged man of depraved character and habits, who had lived a wretched life, and whom they imagined to be at the point of death. I at once acceded to their request, and accompanied them to their house. It was in the country at H—— Marsh, nearly two miles distant from where I lived, and the night was dark and cold;

but I was cheered by the hope of being useful to a poor fellow-creature, who might, even at the eleventh hour, be brought penitentially to see the error of his ways. On my arrival at the cottage where the old man lodged, I found him very ill, and scarcely able to speak, but in an awfully ignorant and hardened state as regards spiritual things. I talked with him very closely on the state of his soul, and the probability of his being soon removed by death to appear before God; but my words made no impression; he turned a deaf ear to all I had to say, and I felt disheartened and distressed. I had never before met with an instance of such total indifference to religion in (what I had reason to think was) a dying hour; and felt greatly disappointed that I should have left my bed and come so far without any good result. After remaining with the old man a long time, and finding all my efforts to arouse him to a sense of his situation useless, I rose to go; but before I left the room I made one more trial, and earnestly besought him to think of the value of his soul, and his need of salvation;—still, however, without avail. I asked "if I should pray with him?" He replied, "No; he did not want prayer." Again and again I repeated the question, but still he replied, "No." For the sake of the family, however, who where present, consisting of the young man and woman before mentioned, with their father and mother, all of whom seemed deeply affected at the hardened state of their kinsman, I read a portion of Scripture and prayed on the landing at the top of the stairs, within hearing of the sick man, and afterwards took leave with a dissatisfied heart, thinking my visit had been quite in vain.

Some time after this, however, I observed the father of the young man very constant in his attendance at the chapel. His appearance was somewhat singular, as he always wore a waggoner's long white frock. The reason of this, as I afterwerds learned, was because he had neither waistcoat nor coat; and although it was in the depth of winter, he came in his shirt sleeves. He was frequently present, too, at our social meetings for prayer, and appeared to be interested and affected.

Pleased to see this, and hoping that some spiritual good was going on in his heart, I took an opportunity of

conversing with him on the subject, and found to my joy that although he had hitherto led a dissolute life, he was resolved (as he said) "to change masters." Hitherto he had been a slave to sin; but now he desired to become a servant of God. "There was a time," said he, "when I had a good coat and other clothes; I had a little stock in trade, and a horse and cart; but I swallowed them all. I was a drunkard; and through drunkenness I broke three of my wife's rib-bones; I ruined my character, I lost my health, and brought my family to beggary. But it shall be so no more. What was said to Silas, though he neglected it, opened my eyes; and now, by the help of God, I wish to begin a new course, and lead a different life." I encouraged him to persevere in his good resolutions, and soon afterwards received him into fellowship with the church. He is now one of our regular communicants, generally takes the lead in our social prayer meetings, assists in the Sunday-School, and is one of the most active and useful men we have among us. His wife is also a steady character, and usually attends the chapel with him.

At the same time that the father began a new course of life, the young man and woman who called me to visit old Silas were added to us in church fellowship. The word of truth, rejected by the old man on that occasion, was not lost on them. From that time they became constant attendants with us, and subsequently were added to our communion by a closer bond. Since they have been connected with us, they have walked, I believe, in accordance with their profession as the followers of Christ. The young man is a teacher in our Sunday-School; he is one of the appointed visitors of the sick, and at our social meetings he usually engages in prayer. He is also an acceptable local preacher: for twelve months he officiated at the chapel in B——, and frequently preaches for me in the chapel at T——. All our friends highly esteem him, and listen to his services, plain as they are, with interest and satisfaction.

And what became of poor, hardened, drunken, swearing, Sabbath-breaking Silas? He is still alive as a monument of the truth of those declarations, Num. xxxii. 23, "Be sure your sin will find you out;" and Job ix. 4,

"Who hath hardened himself against God and prospered?"

The winter before last I began an adult school. One night, among others who came to me for instruction was an old man, led by a little boy. The lad said the old man was quite dumb, but that hearing I had a free school for men, he had brought a piece of slate with him, and wished I would teach him to form letters, so that he might in some degree make himself understood, especially when sent on an errand. For a long time the old man came regularly,—let the weather be ever so wet, or the night ever so dark,—although he had to walk a long way; he was a constant scholar.

That dumb old man was Silas W——. He recovered from the sickness he laboured under when I visited him; but after his recovery he went on worse than before. "His heart was yet more hardened against God," and he sinned "with a high hand and an outstretched arm;" pursuing a course of drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, impiety, and blasphemy; denying religion, and mocking at the idea of a future state. In the midst of this course, however, a heavy affliction fell upon him. His speech was in a moment taken away; and from that time to the present (more than three years) he has not uttered a single word, and in all probability never will again. For the last six months he has been confined to his bed by paralysis, and his condition is most pitiable, being in a state of living death, dumb and helpless, and entirely dependent on the parish and his friends. Poor Silas! He does not mock at religion *now*. He does not refuse prayer *now*. How far there is a change wrought in his heart there are no means by which to ascertain. When I go to his bedside, he bitterly weeps, as though the recollection of his past evil course weighed his spirit down. My hope is that his great affliction has roused him from his sinful state, and brought him to inward penitence and prayer; but, as he is speechless, his frame of mind is to us unknown; and all we can do is to minister as far as needful to his wants, and leave him in the hands of the God and Father of all, who "in the midst of judgment remembers mercy."

From the foregoing simple narrative of facts, there is at least one lesson to be learned, namely—the folly of

being discouraged, merely because we do not see the immediate result of our exertions to benefit our fellow-creatures. If ever any one had reason to be discouraged, I thought *I* had, as to the prospect of any good ever following my visit to Silas W——. Yet in a short time afterwards, what abundant reason I had to rejoice! Alas! we are too apt to imagine our efforts lost, merely because we do not perceive *immediate* good resulting from them; not considering that good may be going on, though unknown to us. Duty is ours; results are God's: all that we have to do, therefore, is to attend to the exhortation of the Apostle, and "be steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord." "Let us, therefore, not be weary in well-doing, for in due time we shall reap if we faint not."

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. III.—RALOO.*

SUCCESSION OF MINISTERS.

1673, 1674. ROBERT KELSO.

[A vacancy of 165 years, during which time Raloo was merged in Broadisland and Larne.]

1839—1848. JOHN COMPTON.
1848—1852. W. O. MACGOWAN.
1852.— THOMAS SMYTH.

THERE was a Presbyterian Congregation at Raloo (a Parish situated between Larne and Carrickfergus, by the old mountain road,) at a much earlier period than is commonly supposed. Nearly two hundred years ago, a person was expressly ordained to the work of the ministry in this secluded district of the country, but neither his ministry nor the Congregation, as then organized, was of long continuance. After a brief struggle for existence, both expired at the end of a very few years, during which time there does not seem to have been a

* I take this Congregation next, not on account of its antiquity, but because, in its present condition, it is an offshoot of the Congregations of Ballycarry and Larne, whose memoirs have already been given.

meeting-house (properly so called) provided for the use of the Congregation, and it was not until 1838 that any such building was erected in Raloo. The history of the rise, decline, and fall of this ancient but short-lived Congregation of Raloo, may be read in the following compend of the Minutes of the Antrim Meeting on the subject, at the dates referred to.

It appears that so early as February 1, 1659, "liberty was given to the people of Raloo to choose a minister upon some conditions set down in that act;" but the Minutes of "the Antrim Meeting" previously to 1671, being unfortunately lost, it is not until the latter year that we have any continuous record on the subject.

"On November 7, 1671, at Ballyclare, some people of Raloo compeared, desiring the settling of Mr. Robert Kelso expectant (*i.e.* probationer) with them as their minister. The brethren appoint, Messrs. Thomas Hall (Larne) and William Shaw (Donegore), to go to Raloo, on Tuesday come eight-days, and Mr. Shaw to preach, and they are to confer with these people about Mr. Kelso's maintenance, and to give report the next meeting." At next meeting (December 5, 1671) the two brethren reported that they had gone, according to appointment, to Raloo, when that people pleaded earnestly that they might be united with those of the Parishes of Broadisland and Larne, that lay conveniently to Raloo, and had formerly contributed with them in Mr. Kelso's maintenance, but the brethren had told them they were not free to act thus, seeing that these people already belonged to a Congregation. This day the people of Raloo appeared before the meeting, and urged their former desire. They also begged that parts of Glynn (or Magheramorne) might be united with them in the support of a minister; but to this, also, the meeting demurred. The Raloo people, however, again urged their request at the meeting at Parkgate, on January 2, 1672, alleging that Glynn (or Magheramorne) was willing to join with them in the work; and therefore the brethren appointed Messrs. Patton (Ballyclare) and Anderson (Glenarm) to go to Glynn, and propound to the people there certain queries on the subject. This was done, and by the report given in on February 19, 1672, at Ballyclare, it appeared

that of ninety-two heads of families convened at Glynn, forty had appeared and declared their willingness to adhere to the ministry of Mr. Cunningham in Broadisland, having united with that parish in Mr. Cunningham's call. In support of this view of the matter, "Gilbert M'Murtry and George Straith, being commissionated from the people of Glynn, appeared and presented a petition signed by twenty-seven heads of families, who had been absent from the meeting convened by the brethren at Glynn, in which they also declared their willingness to adhere to Mr. Cunningham's ministry, and not to join to any other parish, and desired the meeting might do nothing for their disjoining." In opposition to this petition appeared Mr. JOHNSTONE (proprietor of Glynn), accompanied by John Blair, William Adam, &c., &c., "with a supplication from Raloo and Glynn, desiring the settling of Mr. Kelso with them as their minister. The meeting referring to 'the conditions' specified in the Act of February 1, 1659, commend Glynn for adhering to Mr. Cunningham's ministry; and the Commissioners from Raloo desiring further that Mr. Kelso might be appointed to preach amongst* them in the interim; the meeting's answer was, that as they had not forbidden him to preach, so they would not at present advise him, till the people of Raloo, observing the conditions in that former act concerning them, should make it probable that they had a clear way for settling a minister among them."

The Raloo people being thus put on their mettle, appeared by their Commissioners at the subsequent meeting in Ballyclare, on March 19, 1672, and "promised that if the meeting would concur for Mr. Kelso's settlement among them, they would give for his encouragement £20 per annum." The brethren answered that Glynn (or Magheramorne) must be allowed to continue with Broadisland; that the village of Glynn, with the townland of Ballyvernstown, must still belong to Larne; and that if the Raloo people would "call" Mr. Kelso, with a declaration to this effect prefixed to the call, the meeting would concur in his settlement, and they are desired to give an

* I think this word indicates that there was at this time no house of worship in Raloo, and that the labours of the minister were of a perambulatory character.

account of this to the next meeting. In the meantime, "the brethren thought not fit to appoint Mr. Kelso to preach any more among them," but instructed Mr. Haltridge (Islandmagee) to exchange with Mr. Kelso for that purpose. At the subsequent meeting at Parkgate, April 9, 1672, Mr. Haltridge reported "that he had obeyed the appointment and preached at Raloo, but found the people not willing to follow the act of the meeting in reference to Raloo without Glynn." This day they presented a new petition, desiring Mr Kelso to preach among them, and refusing to forbear encroaching on the parishes of Broadisland and Larne." [The remote situation of Raloo always furnished great facilities for poaching of all kinds.] "But the brethren adhering to their former ordinance, and refusing to join with them in this new motion, the people of Raloo desired back their papers. The brethren offered them a double of any paper they desired, or their own papers again, they subscribing a double of them to the Clerk, and the *vera copia* to be *in retentis* as the award of the meeting in that matter." In this position the lovers' quarrel seems to have continued for some time, letters having been mutually returned. But on September 3, 1672, at Ballyclare, the Raloo people made overtures towards a reconciliation, by presenting "a supplication desiring Mr. Robert Kelso to be their minister, which paper did *not* mention Glynn as their former papers had done; and the brethren, willing that Raloo be planted without encroaching on neighbouring parishes, presents this paper to Mr. Kelso, and delivered to him the call which he takes to consider on to the next meeting In the meantime, the brethren appoint him to preach there, and instruct the people to give an account at the next meeting what they will do in reference to his maintenance, and to give bonds for it, and to resolve not to encroach on neighbouring Congregations, and to give this under their hands." At the next meeting at Ballyclare, October 1, 1672, Mr. Robert Kelso declared his willingness to embrace the call from Raloo, and the brethren entered him on trials in reference to that charge. At the subsequent meeting on November 12, 1672, at Ballyclare, "the people of Raloo gave in a subscribed petition, wherewith the meeting was satisfied,

and they resolve to go on with Mr. Kelso's trials in reference to that charge." The particulars of these preparatory trials I give for the satisfaction of those who take an interest in such matters. And indeed they are somewhat curious. In the first place, at this meeting of November 12, Mr Kelso "exercised" on Phil. iii. 8, and was approved, for next meeting he was appointed "to add." At the next meeting, on December 3, 1672, he "added" (the precise meaning of this term for a Presbyterial exercise I know not), and was approved. He was also prescribed "a common head." On January 7, 1673, he "delivered his common head," and was approved, the "disputation" thereon being reserved till the next day. On February 5, 1673, he "sustained disputation on the head," and was approven. A "popular doctrine" was prescribed to him upon Matt. iii. 7, and he was appointed to "sustain trials in the questions and languages the next day, and for the Hebrew the 17th Psalm is prescribed to him." In March he performed these various exercises, "in all which, as in his whole preceding trials, he was approven;" and Mr. John Haltridge was appointed by the meeting "to try the unanimity of the people of Raloo in his call, and what means they have for his maintenance, and to give account the next meeting." At this meeting, held in Ballyclare on April 3, 1673, Mr. Haltridge having reported by letter that he went to Raloo, and found the people there unanimous and well satisfied to have Mr. Robert Kelso for their minister, the brethren appointed his ordination to be at the next meeting, and Mr. Anderson to preach and preside at the ordination. On May 6, 1673, the brethren held their ordinary meeting for business in Larne, and, at the close of the proceedings, "appointed Mr. Robert Kelso's ordination to be *the morn*" (*i.e.*, next morning), at which latter date we have the following record of Mr. Kelso's ordination in Larne "to the function of the ministry in the parish of Raloo":—

"Larne, *May* 7, 1673.—Sermon had by Mr. John Anderson, who, after sermon and prayer did call upon Mr. Robert Kelso, declaring unto him the weightiness of the ministerial charge and his duty, and withal, pressing him on such questions as are usual in the case, he having solemnly declared his assent to these things

proposed, and engaged fidelity in the ministry in that charge of Raloo, together with submission to his brethren in the Lord; the brethren present, to witt,—Mr. John Anderson, Glenarm; Mr. Adam Getty, Ballymena; Mr. Pat. Adair, Cairn Castle; Mr. Thomas Hall, Larne; Mr. Robert Cunningham, Broadisland; Mr. Anthony Kennedy, Templepatrick; Mr. Will. Keyes, Belfast; Mr. John Haltridge, Islandmagee; Mr. David Cunningham, Connor; Mr. Richard Wilson, Drumaul, or Randalstown; Mr. Robert Paton, Ballyclare; Mr. Thomas Gowan, Antrim; Mr. Jaques, Dublin; and Mr. Will. Shaw, Donegore, did ordain, by prayer and imposition of hands, Mr. Robert Kelso, to the function of the ministry in the Parish of Raloo, and thereafter, the brethren present gave him the right hand of fellowship."

To illustrate the foregoing narrative of Mr. Kelso's trials and ordination, I give here the "Rules" which, in April, 1672, the brethren of the Antrim Meeting had adopted for the regulation of both these matters, and which will well repay perusal. The provisions for keeping the ordination "secret," and meeting for that purpose "in some convenient and private place," indicate a strange state of affairs among the Presbyterians of this country as compared with their present condition; whilst the rule enjoining "the newly ordained person to go to Scotland, or some other place out of the bounds of the meeting, where he might exercise his ministerial gifts sparingly and by degrees before he came to the meeting," certainly gives us a favourable view of the wisdom of our ancestors in this matter, which it might be well for us their descendants sometimes to condescend to imitate.

"RULES TO BE OBSERVED IN THE TRIALS OF THE PERSONS TO BE ORDAINED, REBUS UT NUNC STANTIBUS.

"*First.*—We judge it necessary that these trials be as exact and full as ever, *i.e.*, that they be tried by addition, exercise, popular doctrine, common head, and disputes, questionary trials on the sense of Scripture, seemingly contradictory cases, and chronology, with trial of the tongues, that in the worst of times, able and faithful ministers may be continued amongst us.

"A RULE TO BE OBSERVED IN THE WORK OF ORDINATION.

"All things being thus far clear in order to ordination, we think fit that either the whole meeting, or where it is numerous, the major part at least, with the correspondents of the neighbouring meetings, together also with some of the congregation to which the person is to be ordained, either elders, or in case there be no elders, some other person whom the meeting may judge faithful and prudent to keep secret the matter, to meet in some convenient and secret place, where, after one appointed by the meeting hath preached concern-

ing the nature and necessity of the work of the ministry, and after the intrant hath given distinct and positive answers to the questions usually prepared for showing his soundness in the faith, and adhering to the truth professed in the Reformed Churches against Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism, Independency, and whatsoever else is contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, and his resolution to adhere to the covenant; and (considering the temper of these times) he is expressly and particularly to engage to peaceableness and subjection to his brethren in the Lord.

"RULES TO BE OBSERVED AFTER ORDINATION.

"*First.*—The newly-ordained person is to forbear those acts which appertain to him as such, till he go to Scotland or some other place out of the bounds of the meeting where he was ordained, where he may stay for some time, and begin the practice of the ministerial acts, yet sparingly and by degrees."

"*Secondly.*—As he returns to the country, he is to perform duties peculiar to an ordained minister before he come to the meeting."

"*Lastly.*—At the first meeting of the brethren after his return, he is to be received by the brethren as an ordained minister and member of the meeting, and *that* in the presence of some of his Congregation who are, in the name of the Congregation, to receive him as their minister."

In compliance with this last regulation, Mr. Kelso, after his ordination as above described, appeared at the meeting in Ballycarry, on June 3, 1673, when he was received as a member and also chosen clerk of the meeting. "From Raloo appeared, at the same time, in name of the Parish, John Blair and Alexander Dunlop, Elders, and, in presence of the meeting, did accept of Mr. Robert Kelso for their minister, and, in the name of the Parish, did declare their subjection to his ministry." At the same meeting "appeared John M'Agnew* of the Parish of Raloo, who had his house and goods destroyed by accidental fire, and preferred a petition for relief of his present necessity. The meeting recommends him to the charity of all Congregations within their bounds."

(*To be continued.*)

* I think this is a corruption of the present family name,—Agnew. On the list of Presbyterian landholders, whom Cromwell proposed to transport to Tipperary, in 1653, appears, in connexion with the "Islandmagee, Magheramorne, and Ballynure quarters," the name of John Agnew. This may have been the person referred to in the text, for in those days supplicants for Presbyterial charity were very often of gentle blood. It is by no means unusual to find "captains" recommended to the generosity of the brethren. "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul, neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common."

THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

THE meetings of the American Unitarian Association are always significant. The persons composing these meetings are sure to be in earnest on some great questions, or bent on the accomplishment of some good objects. They do not meet simply because a quarterly or annual day of meeting has come round, but because they have important business to transact, and are anxious to do it. The late meeting of their Association, in December, was more than ordinarily interesting and important, for "greater works" now require to be done, and more awfully serious responsibilities must be promptly undertaken. The march of events has brought our American brethren face to face with questions which this generation did not expect that it would be called upon to decide. It is true the worthiest of the land foresaw the abolition of Slavery, "and were glad;" but none dared to dream that the deliverance was *at hand*, or that the event would be initiated by the slave-owners themselves! A few years ago there was no immediate hope for humanity. The dominant party was in power; and the "chivalry" bought and sold their black, and half-black, and only partially black brothers and sisters, dealing in human flesh, and utterly callous to such every-day, familiar things as human sighs and tears. To perpetuate and extend their atrocities, the "chivalry" had been zealously organising for the last thirty years, until at last they believed themselves to be invincible, having created, as they averred, the finest army and the most admirable cavalry force in the whole world. But how the mighty have fallen! How their work of thirty years has been utterly overthrown! The unholy cause for which they traitorously flew to arms, appears now in a much more odious light than before, and must continue to become more hopeless the more it is understood. Indeed, so thoroughly hopeless has it become, that the proud planters are now appealing for protection to the poor negroes whom they have outraged in all the tenderest and most cherished relations of human life. Thus, wondrously enough, slavery is about to be more rapidly abolished by the very party which commenced this bloody rebellion *for the pur-*

pose of preserving it, and the Southern masters now stoop to the lowest imaginable humiliation in asking their slaves to shield them against the power they had so uniformly and insolently defied.

At the late meeting of the Unitarian Association, ample testimony was borne to the fact that Unitarianism could really find no rest for the sole of her foot in the Southern States. This is undoubtedly the proudest and happiest illustration of *Christian* Unitarianism on record. We must indeed rejoice to think that Unitarianism, instead of fawning upon the Slave Power, preferred rather to be ridden on rails, or tarred and feathered, or immured in Southern dungeons. To be sure, there were a few disgraceful instances of ministers doing their best to serve Christ and Belial; but as a general rule, they shook the dust of the sunny South from their feet as a testimony against the abominations which everywhere prevailed. They refused, when not absolutely forced, to commit themselves to the seething flood, where they must have made utter "shipwreck of faith and a good conscience." Better that Christ never should be preached, than that his salvation be made the means of soothing the slaveholder in his guilt, or of deceiving the captive instead of setting him free.

It was quite a common occurrence throughout the Slave States that rich slave-owners, male and female, bequeathed legacies to the churches which they patronized on Sabbath days; or provided, under certain circumstances, for the education of missionaries and ministers. But, after the decease of such liberal patrons, it was almost invariably found that their money consisted of chattels in the shape of men, women, and children, which required to be turned to the best account by the committees of such churches or congregations. The elders of the people then met in solemn deliberation on the question as to whether the slaves, so bequeathed, were more profitable as hired out by the year or sold by the lump. Sometimes the former arrangement was found preferable, and then the wages of these helpless captives were paid as stipend to clergymen for preaching—what? but more frequently the slaves thus obtained were sold in little gangs, men, women, and children,—fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers,

all torn asunder, never to meet again, and the dollars thus realized expended in preparing young men to *preach Christianity to the heathen!!* All who could not acquiesce in these abominations, whether Unitarians or others, were soon given to understand that they must not remain in the South. In every stranger, indeed, if known to be from the North, the Slave Power instantly suspected an enemy, and the faintest expression in favour of equal human rights at once attracted the attentions of Judge Lynch. Even silence at last became suspicious, for it might only be employed to cover some deep Abolitionist design, and silent people were frequently hunted down with all the keen vindictiveness of fear. The mob, always made up of "poor white trash," became legislator, prosecutor, jury, judge, and executioner, in every case, even of suspicion, administering brutal abuse, or imprisonment, or banishment, or death! Before the commencement of the wicked rebellion, arrests and examinations by self-constituted tribunals had become so frequent that the newspapers could hardly find room to chronicle the several cases. At length, in 1860, an Atlanta paper called the *Confederacy* published the following decree, which the people were prepared to enforce as the virtual constitution of the Slave States:—"*We regard every man in our midst an enemy to the institutions of the South who does not boldly declare that he believes African slavery to be a social, moral, and political blessing. Any person holding other than these sentiments, whether born at the South or North, is unsound, and should be requested to leave the country.*" Thus, even Southern birth, or, in the case of Northern origin, long residence at the South, in the quiet pursuit of lawful business, was no guarantee against outrage or destruction, when suspicion was once aroused against any unfortunate dissenter from the atrocious slave system.

Thank God, this dreadful state of affairs is now rapidly changing. Fifty thousand Abolitionists have marched the other day through Atlanta, onward to Savannah, breaking the rod of the oppressor, and setting additional captives free. Of these captives, nearly a million and a quarter have already escaped, and it is truly delightful to know that our Unitarian brethren and sisters are promi-

nently working for their physical and moral comforts. In addition to the task of providing for these helpless multitudes, the Christian people of all denominations in the North have other almost equally pressing work before them, in providing for the spiritual wants of the newly formed States, and endeavouring to introduce Gospel truths and sentiments among the unhappy people of the South. In these noble aims our denomination will undoubtedly give willing and efficient help. The spirit of *Channing* is still with them; for, although dead, his warnings are being better understood every day, and the light of his counsel is guiding many a trembling and sorrowing heart in the path of duty.

G. H.

HOW TO LIVE.

He liveth long who liveth well;
All other life is short and vain:
He liveth longest who can tell
Of living most for heavenly gain.

He liveth long who liveth well;
All else is being flung away:
He liveth longest who can tell
Of true things truly done each day.

Waste not thy being; back to him
Who freely gave it, freely give:
Else is that being but a dream;
'Tis but to *be*, and not to *live*.

Be what thou *seemest!* live thy creed;
Hold up to earth the torch divine;
Be what thou prayest to be made;
Let the Great Master's steps be thine.

Fill up each hour with what will last;
Buy up the moments as they go;
The life above, when this is past,
Is the ripe fruit of life below.

Sow truth, if thou the true wouldst reap ;
Who sows the false shall reap the vain.
Erect and sound thy conscience keep ;
From hollow words and deeds refrain.

Sow love, and taste its fruitage pure ;
Sow peace, and reap its harvest bright ;
Sow sunbeams on the rock and moor,
And find a harvest-home of light.

REVIEW.

THE REFORM OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN WORSHIP, GOVERNMENT, AND DOCTRINE. By ROBERT LEE, D.D., *Minister of Greyfriars, Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Edinburgh, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary in Scotland.* Part I., *Worship.* Edinburgh, Edmonston & Douglas, 1864. 196 pp. 8vo.

[FIRST NOTICE.]

THIS volume by Dr. Lee, a distinguished minister of the Established Church of Scotland, and who is also, we believe, the leader of a reform movement which is now going on in that religious body, treats of a state of affairs in the Scotch Presbyterian Church which so closely resembles that existing among ourselves, that our readers will probably be gratified by an impartial view of its scope and contents, which accordingly we now proceed to give.

After some introductory observations on the necessity of occasional reforms to maintain the vitality of a church, on the innocency and usefulness of judicious innovations, and on the historical fact (which he proves by various instances), that in the method of conducting public worship, the Presbyterian clergy have enjoyed almost unbounded license, our author proceeds to consider what we take to be the germ of the whole matter, and that is the secessions which in all countries have been for some time past continually and largely taking place from Presbyterian to Episcopalian Churches. The reality and

extent of these secessions Dr. Lee does not attempt to deny. Indeed it would be vain and childish for any man to do so. On the contrary, he admits them to their fullest alleged extent. He also admits that fashion, which is the cause commonly assigned by Presbyterian ministers who wish to lay a soothing unction to their souls, will not account for the whole, or nearly the whole, of these defections. He maintains further, that it is not the prospect of getting better preaching which induces Presbyterian flocks to desert Presbyterian folds; for he thinks that the average style of preaching is at least as good in Presbyterian as in Episcopalian Churches. Nor does he conceive that the secessions alluded to arise from any predilection on the part of the seceders for the High Church doctrines of the Episcopal Church. In fact he thinks that the exodus is caused almost entirely by the dislike which has been growing up among intelligent and well educated Presbyterians, of the Presbyterian form of public worship, and the preference on the part of these persons of "the service" of Episcopalian to "the service" of Presbyterian Churches. In this view of the matter we believe that Dr. Lee is supported by many competent judges, and amongst others by the present Duke of Argyle, who, a few years ago, published a pamphlet for the very purpose of warning the Presbyterian clergy on this point, and informing them, as he could do with evident authority, of the real cause of these defections from Presbyterianism to Episcopacy, which they might deplore but could not deny. This, then, is the evil in connexion with Presbyterian worship which Dr. Lee is anxious to reform.

And under this head our author's attention is of course first directed to public prayer, or public worship properly so called. And here he is led to consider the respective claims of what is called "free" or "extempore" prayer, and set forms of prayer, and he gives the preference decidedly to the latter, so far as *public* worship is concerned. He admits that in *some few* Presbyterian Congregations the prayers of the ministers may be excellent, but he maintains that, according to any tenable theory of Church order, they ought to be excellent in *every* Congregation. Now, this he alleges

that they are not; and he adds, with much naïvete but undeniable truth, that if the prayers uttered on any one Sunday in all the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland could be committed to writing and published, they would settle the question of "free prayer" in the opinion of every dispassionate person. We may add, that we think the result of a similar process in the Irish Presbyterian Church would be exactly the same. From this arises a fact alluded to by Dr. Lee, and notorious to us all, that in the matter of Sunday services Presbyterians in general consider the sermon to be almost everything, and the prayers to be almost nothing. They go to meeting "to hear the sermon," or to hear Mr. So-and-so preach. They never pretend that they go to say their prayers, or to worship God. Hence, also, the importance attached by Presbyterian Congregations to the choice of their minister. This is not to be wondered at, seeing that in the matter of their public worship their minister is to them everything. He is their Church, their Liturgy, and their all. In other Christian communities the people are not left so entirely dependent upon one man. In such communities there is a prescribed form of worship which the minister cannot alter, and the sermon being most judiciously postponed until the entire "service," properly so called, is concluded, it follows, that if the people do not like the sermon they can leave it. In Presbyterian Churches the case is entirely different. In them the sermon is what the people come for, and therefore the sermon is *the* thing which they set themselves to criticise, and either to endure or to enjoy. In opposition to this state of things, Dr. Lee makes the following apt quotation from John Calvin's celebrated letter to the Protector Somerset. That Presbyterian reformer says—

"As to what concerns a form of prayer and ecclesiastical rites, I highly approve that there should be a certain form from which the ministers be not allowed to vary; firstly, that some of those who are simple and unskilful may be provided with some help; secondly, that the consent and harmony of the churches (or congregations), one with another, may be made to appear; thirdly, that the rambling and levity of such as affect new and original modes of expressing themselves may be checked. Therefore, there ought to be a stated form of prayer and administration of the sacraments."

These stated forms of prayer, as they exist in the Protestant Churches of these countries, Dr. Lee proceeds to consider in the following order:—(1) The Directory for public worship promulgated by the Westminster Assembly of Divines; (2) John Knox's Book of Common order; and (3) The Book of Common Prayer in use in the English Episcopal Church. To the Directory and Book of Common order, although they are of Presbyterian origin, Dr. Lee awards but scanty praise, whilst on the English Book of Common Prayer he bestows hearty, and, as we think, well-earned commendations. He says—

"It breathes throughout a spirit of pure and elevated piety. It is sufficiently comprehensive without descending to too great particulars. Some of its services throughout, and many passages in most of them, are truly noble compositions, and it very seldom offends against good taste, or genuine Christian feeling. For the most part, also, it is moderate in its tone, temperately recognising Christian doctrines, rather than obtruding or *preaching* them; the chief exceptions being the doctrines of the Trinity and the Divinity of our Lord, in regard to which tenets it is dogmatical and vehement, and sometimes even intolerant and damnatory. On these subjects it reflects too much the keenly controversial spirit and dogmatism of the fourth and fifth centuries."

But Dr. Lee is not an uncompromising ritualist. He suggests a *via media* between "free" and "formal" prayer. He says,—

"Many of us have come to be of opinion that *every thing* should be left, as it now is, to the discretion of each minister; that some assistance should be afforded; some public formulary prepared which may be used in certain parts of the church service, and especially in administering the sacraments, and on some other special occasions; but I can hardly believe that any number of our ministers have adopted the opinion that free prayer should be abolished in our church; that a public liturgy should supersede altogether the prayers which each minister may occasionally see fit to introduce from his own mind and of his own composition. In short, even those who are most resolute in their opinion that some public formulary should be introduced, and used to a certain extent, would probably be found nearly unanimous in their opposition to any ritual—such as the Book of Common Prayer—which should take away altogether the right of free prayer from the ministers of the church."

On this point some people might be inclined to differ from the learned Doctor, and to think that prayer should

never be presented in public without being suitably prepared, and that free prayer should always be kept at home.

The consideration of Dr. Lee's practical suggestions for the reform of public worship in Presbyterian Churches, as well as of some other matters suggested by his interesting volume, must be deferred until next month, as our present available space is exhausted.

INTELLIGENCE.

INSTALLATION AT MONEYREA.

On Thursday, December 29, the Presbytery of Antrim met at Moneyrea, for the purpose of installing the Rev. David Thompson, late of Sale, near Manchester, as pastor of the Non-Subscribing Congregation there. The ministers belonging to the Presbytery of Antrim present on that occasion were—Revs. John Porter, Belfast; John Jellie, Belfast; William Hall, Greyabbey; William Orr M'Gowan, Ravara; and David Gordon, Banbridge. The Revs. John Orr and John M'Caw, of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, were also present.

Mr. M'Gowan preached from Luke xii. 22,—"Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." The members of the congregation were then asked by the Rev. J. Jellie if they still adhered to the call which they had given to Mr. Thompson. They signified their adherence to it by holding up their right hands. Mr. Thompson stated that he also abided by his acceptance of the call. Being then asked if he had any statement of his views and feelings to make, after a few introductory remarks, he said—I stand in the presence of this assembly to-day not to indulge in profession, which, however honestly made, may never be carried into practice; but I stand here before you declaring that I come to this work with an earnest and sincere desire to do it faithfully. I come to it believing in the one God, who is the Father of us all, and in the one Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Saviour of us all; believing that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain a revelation from God, and that, if we follow the guidance which it gives, we cannot fail to walk in the safe and blessed way; believing that God is as near his children now as ever He was in any former time, and that it is the true end of our being to rise towards Him by loving and serving Him, and developing the powers we have received in beautiful proportions; believing that our nature is not corrupt, not tainted in its very source, but that it contains the germ of goodness, and is capable of endless growth and perfectability. And so, believing in the living God, who is present with us at all times, and in Jesus Christ, our teacher, our guide, our

Saviour, and in the nature which God has given to us, with all its hopes and aspirations after things right and true, corresponding, as they do, with what is noble and divine in the pages of Scripture—I say, believing these things, I come to you, willing to spend and be spent in helping forward the cause of truth and righteousness, the cause of Christ and God. I believe that we are all members of one common family, have one common Father in Heaven, one common Lord and Saviour, and one common home beyond this world, prepared for all who live up to the light they possess, whatever their name may be. Feeling that we are under God's care, and that we all share in His loving kindness and tender mercy, that there is no spot in the universe where we can flee from His presence, and that He is not willing that any soul he has formed should perish, but that all should turn to Him, and live in peace and blessedness, I am encouraged to put my hands, feeble as they may be, to the work to which you have called me. I am sure that no well-directed effort is ever made in vain; and, if we only try to do the duty which has been assigned to us, some good must surely come. I feel that it is within reach of us all to live a more Christian life than we have ever lived before, and to realise in our day and generation what it is to be the offspring of God, by doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with Him. I believe there is a great and good work for you, for me, for all of us to do in this place. I am willing to do my part, as far as God gives me strength and ability. My best powers are at your service, and the fervent prayer of my heart is, that we may all become more faithful disciples of the Lord Jesus, not merely in outward profession but in spirit and life; in all our thoughts, and words, and actions, and then our hearts and homes will be blessed indeed, and religion will be a living power in the midst of us.

Mr. Jellie then delivered the usual charge to the newly-appointed minister and the congregation, dwelling at considerable length on their respective duties, and hoping that they would assist each other in carrying forward the Christian work in which they were all engaged. The installation service was brought to a close with singing and prayer.

At three o'clock the members of the Presbytery and the other ministers present were entertained at dinner in the School-house by the congregation. The Rev. John Porter occupied the chair, and the Rev. John M'Caw the vice-chair.

After dinner, the usual loyal toasts having been duly honoured, the Chairman next proposed the toast of "The Rev. David Thompson and the Non-Subscribing congregation of Moneyrea," and in doing so said he had seldom been more happy—he might say he had never been so happy—at the installation of any minister as on the present occasion. The congregation wanted a man like Mr. Thompson. The Presbytery of Antrim wanted a man like him; and although he had not had the pleasure of Mr. Thompson's acquaintance until he came over to take charge of the congregation, yet his character was not unknown to him; and he was sure and certain that never did a congregation do a wiser or a better act, or an act more redounding to its own high intelligence and character, or more complimentary to the object of its own choice, than when the

Congregation of Moneyrea brought that young gentleman to succeed their honoured—he might almost say immortal—but, at all events, their honoured minister, and the minister honoured by all, Fletcher Blakely. From the depths of his heart, he wished all health and prosperity for the congregation and their minister, and would give them, as a toast, "The Rev. David Thompson and the Congregation of Moneyrea."

Mr. THOMPSON replied in feeling terms, dwelling on the attachment he felt to the people of Sale, and stating that he accepted the call to Moneyrea, in the belief that he could be more useful there. He referred to the Presbytery of Antrim, and said he was proud of being received into a body, which was noted for its devotion to the cause of truth and liberty—that did not shackle any minister by creeds, or ties, or anything of that kind—and that allowed a man to speak the truth of God as he found it.

Mr. JOSHUA M'MASTER responded to the toast on behalf of the Congregation, and proposed the health of their Chairman, the Rev. John Porter. The Chairman, having responded, gave "the Memory of the Rev. Fletcher Blakely and the Rev. John Berryhill"—which was drunk in solemn silence. The next toast was "The Presbytery of Antrim and the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland," to which the Rev. David Gordon and the Rev. John Orr replied.

The remaining toasts were—"Civil and Religious Liberty," "The Officiating Ministers of the Day," and "The Vice-Chairman, Rev. John M'Caw."

[The foregoing report of the recent installation at Moneyrea is condensed from that which appeared in *The Northern Whig* of the following day, and which was from the special reporter of that journal. The views explicitly stated by the minister elect are thoroughly Christian, and would satisy the requirements of any Non-Subscribing body with which we are acquainted. But we regret that a fuller account was not given of the after-dinner proceedings, and especially that no report was published of the speech of the chairman, in introducing the toast of "The Presbytery of Antrim, and the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland;" for we have been informed, on unquestionable authority, that he declaimed very loudly against the Northern Presbytery of Antrim and the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster. We can readily imagine how he would ring the changes on "creeds" and "sectarianism," on "free inquiry" and "absolute religious liberty;" and flatter himself, and perhaps a few others, that theirs was the only Free Church in Ulster, and that some who called themselves Non-Subscribers were creed-mongers and intolerant bigots. Unfortunately, however, it devolved on the Rev. John Orr to respond on behalf of the Remonstrant Synod; and that gentleman, feeling that his principles were so unhandsomely assailed, thought it right to criticise the chairman's remarks, and expose the platitudes in which he had so foolishly indulged. We believe it was the desire of the people of Moneyrea that no reference should be made to late controversies, and that the whole proceedings should be peaceable and harmonious. That they were not so was the fault of the chairman.—ED. CH. UN.]

Sunday School Soiree.—The annual entertainment of the Congregational Sunday School connected with the Unitarian Domestic Mission was held in the school building, Stanhope Street, on Tuesday evening, January 2, and was most numerously attended, the two large rooms in which the scholars assemble being completely filled at tea, which was served in each. Among the visitors present were—Rev. John Scott Porter, Rev. T. Bowring, J. M. Darbishire, W. Dobbin, W. H. Greer, T. Hill, and A. M'Mechan, Esqrs. A very pretty tree—the kind gift of Mrs. John Porter, which had been one of the attractions at the late Ulster Hall Bazaar—was profusely decked with lights and with all descriptions of toys for the children. The chair was taken by the Rev. T. Bowring, who congratulated the very large assembly, now crammed into the upper room, on their again coming together on such a pleasing occasion; apologising, also, for the absence of the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, who was unavoidably prevented from meeting them, but who desired to convey the expression of his deep sympathy in all connected with the mission. The Sunday School premiums were then distributed by the Chairman, the faces of the recipients beaming with delight. After a short interval, the Rev. J. Scott Porter proceeded to the equally pleasing task of unlading the tree, and dispersing the fruit. Every scholar present received something. "God Save the Queen" was then sung in grand chorus, Miss Emily Bowring presiding at the harmonium, and was followed by an earnest and affectionate address from the Rev. Mr. Porter, which made a manifest impression upon those present. The dismissal hymn, with a benediction, closed these interesting proceedings of the Belfast Domestic Mission.

HOME MISSIONARY BOARD, MANCHESTER.

The object of this Institution is to train men filled with the spirit of practical religion as missionaries to spread the religion of Christ. The annual public examination was held on Monday, the 16th inst., and the two following days. The annual business meeting was held on Monday evening. In the absence of the president, John Grundy, Esq, of Summerseat, one of the vice-presidents, presided. The Rev. James Drummond read the annual report, which was very satisfactory. It reviewed the operations of the Board during the ten years of its existence, and set forth the views of its managers. The annual accounts were then submitted, and resolutions were passed, accepting the report and Treasurer's statement of accounts, appointing officers for the ensuing year, and thanking the examiner, and the conductor of the dedicatory services. The Rev. W. Binns, agreeably to a motion which he had previously published, moved—"That, as there exists a wide-spread feeling in favour of some modification of the educational system at present pursued by the Home Missionary Board, a special committee be appointed to inquire whether or not any modification be desirable, and if so, in what way and to what extent; the said committee to report results to a special meeting of the subscribers, to be summoned at such date as shall be hereafter fixed." He supported the motion at some length. It was seconded by the Rev. J. C. Street.

The Rev. J. Wright moved an amendment to the effect—"That this meeting, cordially approving of the general plan on which the Board has hitherto been conducted, namely, a three years' *curriculum*, combining, during the whole time, instruction in practical work with intellectual training, has full confidence that the committee will introduce any improvements in matters of detail which may from time to time be found practicable." The Rev. Dr. Beard seconded the amendment, and read a paper, minutely detailing the course of instruction through which he had gone with the students, and shewing the mode on which he had endeavoured to carry out the objects of the Board. A long discussion ensued, and the question being put, 40 voted for the amendment, and 3 for the original motion. On Tuesday evening the annual soiree was held in the Town Hall, Henry Coppock, Esq., presiding; and on Wednesday afternoon the examinations were terminated with an address from the examiner, the Rev. H. Green, who took an opportunity of distinctly expressing his belief in Jesus as the divinely-appointed Teacher and Saviour, but at the same time of disclaiming any right to exercise leadership over the faith of others.

GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCH, PORTSMOUTH.

This place of worship, which has been considerably enlarged, was re-opened on Tuesday, January 10. Service commenced at seven o'clock, the opening sermon being preached by the Rev. William James, of Bristol. The church was crowded.

On the following afternoon there was a tea meeting, when upwards of two hundred were present. After tea a public meeting was held, under the presidency of Sir John Bowring, LL.D., F.R.S. After the singing of a hymn—"From all that dwell below the skies," Sir John Bowring said—My Christian friends, we have the privilege of living under the genial reign of a sovereign during which intolerance has received a sharp rebuke. Her Privy Council has declared that it is no longer necessary, as a part and portion of the Christian religion, to believe that the case of any mortal, however depraved, is utterly hopeless. It has not cared to recognise what to me is the most dreadful and most repulsive of all religious doctrines—the belief that the Divine Being has created the infinite majority of his children to be doomed to perpetual misery. And the Privy Council has also declared that reverence for the Scriptures does not imply the necessity of repudiating the light which philosophic discovery and research have since thrown upon that Holy Book. We should be grateful for the position in which we stand; we should feel that we are moving "gradually out of darkness into marvellous light;" and feeling, as we feel, love and reverence for that great and good woman to whom the destinies of so many millions of human beings are to some extent committed, it appears to me that it is not improper, unreasonable, irreligious, or unchristian that we should now sing the National hymn.

"God Save the Queen" having been sung by the audience, the Chairman then addressed the meeting at considerable length, and in eloquent terms, dwelling on the progress of truth, notwith-

standing all the obstacles that were interposed to check it; and then showing that the religion of Christ required us to help and to sympathise with one another. He concluded by referring to the recent visit of the Rev. William James to the Holy Land. With that land, he said, I am somewhat familiar, for it has been my privilege to land on the borders of Orontes, to visit the ancient city of Antioch, where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians; to have seen the ruins of the Churches in the Rocks, in which Christ is said to have worshipped; to have followed down the course of the Jordan; to have lived for some time at Damascus, that beautiful city of which Orientals say, "It's a diamond encircled by emeralds," green and beautiful as it was in the days of Abraham, whose rivers still flow as crystal as in the times of old, and of which, to this day, the inhabitants boast. I have crossed the Jordan; I have tarried at the well at which our Saviour drank water; and at that very well a woman let down her pitcher and offered me to drink. The Bible and the New Testament are not books of yesterday, but books of to-day.

The Rev. E. R. GRANT, the minister of the chapel, stated that theirs was the oldest dissenting place of worship in the borough; in 1616 a few of their friends used to meet in a little room. The time came when persons were allowed to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience; a larger chapel was then built, and they had now been obliged to enlarge that chapel, and the attendance this evening showed that they did not enlarge it before it was necessary.

Mr. JAMES, in acknowledging a vote of thanks for his discourse at the re-opening of the chapel, said that he was deeply indebted to them for the cordial way in which they had spoken of his services. Referring to their kind congratulations on his journey to the East, he remarked that, in visiting the Holy Land, the dream of his boyhood had been realised. He then gave a most graphic and interesting description of his journey, illustrating it by some beautifully-executed drawings, and in conclusion said that after visiting the various spots mentioned in sacred history, he returned with a deeper conviction of the truth of the Gospel narratives.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Everton Village, Liverpool, on December 28, Arthur Dunn, eldest son of John Dunn, of Belfast, aged 41 years.

Died, at Sydenham, on January 2, Mary, wife of C. B. Grimshaw, Esq.

Died, on January 5, at 157, Botanic Road, Belfast, Jane, relict of the late James Carruthers.

Died, on January 15, at Martello Terrace, Margaret, wife of William Hartley, Esq., aged 37 years.

Died, on January 9th, in the 57th year of his age, the Rev. Owen Evans, Minister of the Unitarian Chapel, Cefn Coed-y-cymmer, South Wales. Mr. Evans was a native of the County of Cardigan, and was educated for the ministry at the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen. He was first settled as assistant to the Rev. Timothy Davis, at Evesham, Worcestershire; but feeling that the poor districts of Wales stood more in need of his services than the richer churches in England, with a rigid conscientiousness which was a marked element in his character, he left a good position in obedience to the call of duty, and laboured for a time at the secluded Chapel of Blaengwrach, in the Vale of Neath. He afterwards settled at Cefn, where he ministered to a small and poor, yet faithful, Congregation, at a stipend which seldom amounted to £30, for the long term of twenty-eight years; and during that period he took an active part in the quarterly and annual meetings of the Unitarians of South Wales, as well as in the literary and theological discussions which arose from time to time. He had been slightly ailing for a few days. On Sunday morning he preached as usual, but said he felt unwell. He was unable to preach in the evening. On Monday evening, after taking supper, he sat down by his fireside; the paper which he was reading suddenly dropped from his hand, he fell back in his chair with a slight moan, and in a moment all was over. He has left a widow and three children to lament the sudden loss of a kind husband and an affectionate father.

As a teacher, Mr. Evans was beloved by his pupils, and as a preacher, he was always animated and often impressive. He belonged to the old school of Unitarianism. He had exalted views of the importance of the ministerial office, and was always ready to give elementary classical instruction to young men of every denomination, on the sole condition of their dedicating themselves to the work of the ministry. The esteem and affection which were entertained for him by all parties in the neighbourhood in which he lived, and largely throughout the district, is evidenced by the lengthened and gratifying notices which have appeared of him in *The Merthyr Express* and *The Merthyr Telegraph*. The funeral of Mr. Evans took place on Friday, January 13, and was attended by large numbers of various denominations; only a small portion of the assemblage could find room in the chapel. The services were conducted by the Rev. Thomas Thomas, of Pantydefaid, whose address, based on Heb. xiii. 7, was most striking and effective; it was evident that the sad event bore heavily on his feelings, and all seemed deeply impressed. Death has been busy of late among the small band of Unitarian ministers in Wales, and it is difficult to see how the losses thus sustained can soon be supplied.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] MARCH, 1865. [No. 2.

THE PRESBYTERY OF ANTRIM WITH ITS TEST AND NO TEST.

THE University of Cambridge has an officer called the "Public Orator," whose duty is to speak on its behalf on all occasions of state ceremonial; and the Presbytery of Antrim has seemingly conferred a similar office on the Rev. John Porter, of Belfast; who, it must be admitted, discharges its duty with much energy and industry. At all public gatherings at which the reverend body to which he belongs is the subject of laudation, (and they have occurred very frequently), he is uniformly the person deputed to speak in its name, and he performs the pleasing task of self-eulogy, (with an occasional intermixture of censure directed against certain other Churches), with evident satisfaction to himself, and no doubt to the full contentment of those whom he represents. Among his efforts in this species of eloquence, his oration at Moneyrea in 1863, and his three speeches in one evening at Ballyclare, will occur to the memory of all who heard them, or read them, as reported in the public prints.

We believe, however, that one of his most characteristic addresses is in danger of being lost to the world, through circumstances which will appear in the sequel: we allude to his speech in proposing the toast of "the Presbytery of Antrim and the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland," at the dinner which followed the installation of Mr. Thompson in the Congregation of Moneyrea on the 29th of last December. Thinking it a great pity that so interesting a document should be lost, we were anxious to see it in print; but hitherto our hopes have been disappointed. We learn, however, that in introducing the above sentiment to the meeting, Mr. Porter delivered

a great speech, in the course of which he lauded the Presbytery of Antrim, (*i.e.*, his own Presbytery), to the skies, and made a fierce assault on the Remonstrant Synod and the Northern Presbytery of Antrim. He declared that the first-named Presbytery was the only body of real non-subscribers in the North of Ireland; that it and its members are perfectly free and unshackled, bound by no creed, imposing no test, enjoying and asserting absolute liberty on all religious questions whatsoever, and maintaining this perfect freedom from doctrinal restraint as the inalienable right of their congregations, people, and ministers. On the other hand, he characterized the Remonstrant Synod and the Northern Presbytery of Antrim as fettered by creeds and tests, and as tyrannically imposing a yoke on the necks of all their ministers and churches. We regret that we are not able to give the exact words of the speaker, but the foregoing, we have reason to believe, is a correct summary of its substance.

The Rev. David Gordon, in acknowledging the toast on behalf of the Presbytery of Antrim, followed, at an humble distance, in the steps of his leader. He expressed himself, we understand, in a tone of greater moderation, and with considerably less fervour of language and manner; but still he adopted and repeated his sentiments in substance. So long as the two reverend gentlemen had the speaking to themselves, they gave themselves the best of characters; and to their brethren they dealt out blows, if not very heavy, still bestowed with a hearty goodwill. But when Mr. Orr, the clerk of the Remonstrant Synod, rose to return thanks in its name, the case was altered. Mr. Orr could not avoid taking notice of the accusations flung upon the church which on that occasion he represented. He took up the speech of the chairman, analysed its arguments and exposed its fallacies, in an address which, we have been informed, was one of distinguished ability. He proved in a convincing manner that the Remonstrant Synod *imposes no creed or test*, if these terms be used in the sense in which they have always been employed and understood in the controversy respecting subscription: or that, if the declaration which it requires be denominated a test, (which in a certain sense undoubtedly it is), then

that the Presbytery of Antrim has also, according to its own solemn and repeated declarations, *a test of the very same nature*,—namely the *Sufficiency of Scripture;* and consequently that its members, requiring an assent to that theological doctrine, have no right to accuse their brethren, who only imitate their example,—of departing from the principles of non-subscription. The chairman attempted to answer Mr. Orr, but distinctly admitted that the Presbytery of Antrim,—which, in his former oration he had eulogised as free from all theological or doctrinal tests,—had after all *a test;* and that, one of a distinctly theological and doctrinal kind. We regret that no report of this interesting discussion has appeared. Reporters were present, and took notes of the proceedings. Mr. Orr, before the close of the evening, demanded, as a matter of justice and right, that if the chairman's speeches were reported, his replies should also be given. Neither has been published.

Surprise has been expressed in various quarters that Mr. Porter, who has so often been called on to speak in public on the principles of the Presbytery of Antrim, and might be supposed to be well informed on a subject which has on many occasions furnished a theme for his eloquence, should have been led to give two conflicting representations of those fundamental principles in the course of the same evening. His Presbytery has *no creed*, and it *has a creed;* it has *a test*, and it has *no test!* But really he is not to be blamed for this. His conduct admits of an apology, which if not quite satisfactory, at least may fairly be pleaded in mitigation of censure. As the advocate and champion of the Presbytery of Antrim, he could scarcely avoid the inconsistency into which he fell; for, strange as it may appear, the Presbytery itself has, through its recognized organs, by its own recorded acts, and in its express and solemn declarations, maintained and asserted, and still maintains and ratifies, *both* the foregoing statements, though mutually destructive. This goes a great way in excusing Mr. Porter; and the fact is susceptible of proof, short, plain, and indisputable.

To begin, then, with the first assertion of Mr. Porter, namely,—that the Presbytery of Antrim acknowledges

no creed, imposes no test, requires no assent to any religious doctrine whatsoever,—we conceive that he was fully authorized to make it, not only by his own declaration, made on a former occasion, and in the very same place, in the presence of the Presbytery and amidst the plaudits of its members, that "absolute religious liberty is its principle," but by the letter of the Moderator to the Boston *Christian Register* of the 6th Sept., 1862, in which he asserts, on behalf of his co-presbyters, that they are "bound by *no creed whatever*;" that it is their ruling principle that when a congregation has elected a minister, no one "has any right at ordination or installation to require *any test of belief whatever* as a condition of religious communion" with him; and that "their essential bond of union is *free inquiry*" simply. Agreeably with these announcements, the Presbytery accepted the charge of a congregation, which, though its Elder and Commissioner declared that it would not allow the minister whom it might choose, to be asked *any question whatever* as to his religious belief as a condition of his being ordained or installed;—a declaration which was so far from being unsatisfactory to the reverend body to whom it was made, that it immediately passed a vote recording "its *strong sympathy* with the people of York Street, in their assertion of the principles of non-subscription," and accepting them as a congregation under its care. Nor can it be forgotten that the Elder who gave in the declaration referred to, is the same who afterwards avowed that it was "their desire to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense; which," on the contrary, "should admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahommedans;—which should not even exclude Atheists; nay, in which a minister, who," after his ordination, "might become an Atheist, should not be called on to resign." At the installation which took place in that congregation, soon after its admission under the care of the Presbytery, the Moderator, who conducted the most important part of the service, declared that it would be an "insult" to ask the gentleman who was about to be accepted into the fellowship of the brethren, "if he believed in Christ, or in the Scriptures!" Accordingly, *no question whatever was put to him, touching his*

religious belief. He made a declaration of his belief in Christ, *but not in compliance with any demand* ; nothing of the kind was required. He volunteered to make it. Not to dwell too long on such particulars, we may here state in brief, that the very same procedure was followed at the installation which took place in Ravara, in November, 1862 ; at the ordination in Carrickfergus, in the December of the same year ; at that in Moneyrea, in March, 1863 ; and at the recent installation in the same place. Thus, for the last three years the practice of the Presbytery of Antrim has been perfectly consistent, in recognizing *no sort of religious belief whatsoever* as necessary in persons who seek to be admitted as ministers into its bosom. It has ordained and installed all comers, "no questions asked,"—at least none relating to faith or doctrine ; and, doubtless, it is willing to follow up the same precedent hereafter, by installing or ordaining all who present themselves, without so much as inquiring whether they believe in Christ, or in the God who sent him. Unquestionably, therefore, Mr. Porter was fully justified by these, the public and deliberate acts of his Presbytery, in affirming that, as he expressed it in a speech delivered at Moneyrea, in the year 1863,—"*Absolute religious liberty is the principle of the Presbytery of Antrim.*"

And now, we proceed to prove, secondly, that he had authority for affirming the very contrary principle,—namely—that the Presbytery of Antrim *has a doctrinal test, a creed, a bond of union*, in which it declares that all who seek for admission into its fellowship *must*, as a needful preliminary, *express their concurrence.* Of the voluminous evidence in support of this assertion of Mr. Porter's we select a few particulars only.

On the 30th of March, 1863, all the ministers who then constituted the Presbytery of Antrim joined in an affidavit in aid of the respondents in the suit regarding the meeting-house of Ballyclare ; in the course of which they swear, "that the only *matter of faith or belief required* by the Presbytery of Antrim *to be assented to* by its members from the time of its exclusion from the Synod of Ulster," [in the year 1726], "to the present day, was *the reception of the Holy Scriptures as the sole rule of faith and practice.*" And they further swear that "the true and only principles

of the Presbytery of Antrim" are set forth by the Rev. William Bruce, in his examination before the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, in 1824, when he stated, speaking of the Antrim Presbytery:—"*Our only bond of union is to acknowledge the Scriptures only*:"—by the Rev. J. Scott Porter in his *Brief Outline of Christian Unitarianism*, published in 1834, when he states,—"We carry our reverence for the sacred volume to a great length. . . . . We own it as sufficient for the purposes of all Christian communities, societies, and churches. We have therefore unanimously constituted *the Bible our sole creed*; . . . . we find the Bible amply sufficient as our *bond of union, and accredited creed*:"—and by the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, who said, in his letter to the Rev. J. D. Hull of Bangor,—"I maintain that if man *signify his belief in the Word of God*, the Church of Christ should be satisfied;" and in his reply to an address from his congregation, in 1838:—"As a Christian church we glory in *maintaining* the great principle of the Reformation,—*The Bible is a sufficient Rule of Faith*." Much more might be added to the same effect from the same document, and from other sources; but the foregoing are abundantly sufficient to bear out Mr. Porter's declaration at the Moneyrea dinner, that the Presbytery of Antrim,—which denounces creeds,—*has, nevertheless, a creed of its own*; that while it repudiates tests of faith,—it *has, nevertheless, a test of faith*, adhesion to which is its accredited bond of union. The two points certainly are opposed to each other, as light is to darkness; but the inconsistency is not of Mr. Porter's making. It is made by the Presbytery itself.

We now come, in the third place, to shew that Mr. Porter had full authority for joining the two contradictory principles together *in the same sentence*, if he had been so disposed. Had he done so, he would have done no more than the Presbytery itself has done in a former affidavit sworn in the same case by the same nine reverend gentlemen; for they say, "it is not the custom of the Presbytery of Antrim to put *any doctrinal or testing questions* to the candidates for the ministry on occasions either of license, ordination, or installation" (here is Mr. Porter's first proposition which repudiates *all* doctrinal tests); "it being *understood* that the *said candidates adhere to the*

fundamental principles of the said Presbytery, viz., *the sufficiency of the Scriptures alone as a rule of faith and practice*, and *the right of private judgment*, and the *rejection of all human authority in matters of faith*,"—which affirms the speaker's second proposition, with the addition of two very important and distinctly doctrinal articles to the test. It may be thought, indeed, that by using the word "*understood*" in the second clause of the sentence, the reverend gentlemen wished to imply that the candidate's adherence to the doctrinal test was only a *tacit* understanding; a thing taken for granted in all cases, though it might or might not be true in some; a thing, in short, never inquired into or demanded. But as the Rev. S. C. Nelson, the Rev. H. Moore, and the Rev. David Gordon, in their second affidavit, distinctly swear that questions were put to each of them at their respective ordinations or installations, by authority of the Presbytery, to ascertain their agreement in its oft-recited fundamental principles, before they were set apart to their office as ministers; and as we cannot impute to them a design to mislead the court by their affidavits solemnly sworn, we feel ourselves not only authorised, but, by the common rules of candour, compelled to interpret the word "*understood*" as equivalent to *ascertained:* so that *both* Mr. Porter's mutually destructive propositions are affirmed by the ministers of the Presbytery of Antrim, in one and the same sentence, under their solemn oaths.

And perhaps in this connexion it might not be irrelevant to quote the statement made by the Rev. Hugh Moore, one of the seniors of the body, in his address at the installation of Mr. M'Gowan at Ravara. "*It has been the uniform practice*" [in the Presbytery of Antrim] "to request the person chosen by the Congregation to state, for the satisfation of the Congregation, . . . clearly and distinctly his views on entering on the work of the ministry, and *to answer any questions* that the Congregation *or installing ministers may choose to put to him*." This very explicit declaration of the "*uniform practice*" he of course followed up by proposing to the candidate no question whatever! We take Mr. Moore's words from the newspaper in which they were published the next day. In *The Non-Subscriber* (now defunct), the

organ of the *very, very liberal* section of the Church, they were *suppressed*, as was to be expected.

We have now, we trust, sufficiently vindicated the "public orator" of the Presbytery of Antrim from the imputations which might rest upon him in consequence of his conflicting statements respecting its fundamental principles. If they cannot be reconciled,—and to us, at least, they seem diametrically opposed to each other,—the fault is not his. They have both been put forward by the reverend body itself; the *first*, upon its word; the *second*, upon its oath: and when we take into account that its practice, as at present regulated, agrees with the former, but by no means with the latter, we feel that we only do its members justice when we declare that, in our judgment, their word is as good as their oath. And we may say, in fine, that the Presbytery of Antrim, according to its own shifting representations, may be described in terms borrowed from an old saw, as "perfect with a creed, perfect without a creed; perfect with a test, perfect without a test; perfect with either, neither, or both."

J. S. P.

ANTI-SUPERNATURALISM IN THE PULPIT.

(*Concluded from p.* 10.)

The Bible or the mathematics as the basis of preaching,—in the long run it must come to that. Either of these represents a valid and intelligible principle; nothing between them does. Either of these stands for authority; nothing between them does. Even now I should say that the graduate of the Scientific School is better qualified to be a preacher of righteousness to his fellow-men than the graduate of the Divinity School, whose three years of theological study have weakened instead of strengthening his faith in the Gospel and all Christian traditions, and have brought him to accept, as his solution of the great historic and miraculous fact of Christianity, the theory thus stated by a recent critic,—that, eighteen hundred years ago, in Galilee and Judæa, on the shores of Tiberias

and round about Jordan,—"nothing happened." Hence these wonderful writings, whose inspired breath still perfumes the Church and the closet with the incense of holiness. Hence the tragedies of the Roman amphitheatre. Hence the life of solitude and prayer of countless saints. Hence Peter's "wondrous dome" and Dante's immortal verse, and a winter landing of the Puritans on the outside of the world.

All this the fruit of certain poems which men have styled the Gospels according to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John! Or rather, of the nothing in particular which dictated those poems, and the fabrications they embody and present to us as historical facts,—the only admissible fact being, that, among the teachers who have undertaken to instruct mankind, there was one Jesus whom his followers called the Christ, a pure-minded and benevolent man, who died, as many others have done, a martyr to his well-meant efforts to reform his countrymen.

My quarrel with the anti-supernaturalism of the present day is, that it satisfies no spiritual or intellectual want. It is neither one thing nor the other, neither religion nor science; too self-willed for the one, not positive enough for the other. It is any man's opinion of human and divine things, with no definite authority, human or divine, for its warrant.

Let me not be misunderstood: I have no controversy with anti-supernaturalism as such, except as one opinion implicitly controverts the opposite opinion. I speak of it only as standing-ground for the preacher who comes before the world as nominally a Christian minister, and assumes the charge of a nominally Christian Church. I say that the preacher who takes that ground betrays the Gospel he is supposed to represent. He places himself in direct antagonism with the radical idea of that Gospel which claims on the face of it superhuman authority. I acknowledge, of course, a code of Christian ethics which may be considered and may be preached independently of this claim, and I am far from denying that an individual whose character and ability are such as to give him weight may do a good work as a preacher of Christian morals, without that faith in Christ which constitutes a Christian believer, in the stricter sense.

But, after all, the moral law alone is mere Judaism over again,—Judaism without its sanction. Christianity means a great deal more than that. It means participation of the Divine Nature, through faith, and through the communion of the Spirit, of which the Church is supposed to be the repository and the mediator. Of this there is no pretence and no thought in the kind of ministration to which I have referred. Whatever the merit or use of such ministration in any particular case, its meaning is bounded by the speaker's personality; it stands for nothing but his opinion; it surrogates a lectureship and a Sunday lyceum for the Christian Church.

Meanwhile, it owes to that Church its place and opportunity and leave to be. Take away the Christian Church, and how long would the preacher's profession endure? How long would the lecturer on morals and theism find an audience? I mean a stated Sunday audience, a congregation pledged to his support? How long would the Sunday itself survive? Be sure, it is not the itching ear and the fluent tongue, it is not the weekly demand and supply of mortal wit, that created and maintains that sacred custom, and which made it impossible in revolutionary France for a nation to do it away. It has other authors and supports than these: Reverence and Faith and grey Tradition,—already grey when Jesus went into the synagogue at Nazareth on the Sabbath day, "as his custom was." These, and withal a sense of mystery and holiness not yet extinct,—even in curious, questioning New England, God be praised! not quite extinct; the sense of a fathomless and awful background to this every-day world, and a Presence that pervades it, and a righteous God, and the consciousness of sin and the need of pardoning grace; and supplication and sacraments that came not of "art or man's device." All this is in the heart of the Christian Sunday, and this is its warrant and reason for being, without which the Lord's day would straightway subside into the secular week, and the Christian rubric, which now tints the civil calendar as with streaks of a heavenly dawn, would go out in one uniform sanctionless, savourless black. For though the day being given and the temple being given, anti-supernaturalists and secularists, and trance-mediums, and all manner of alien voices

and ministrations, may find place in its courts; it is not these nor the like of these, for whose sake the temple and the Sunday exist. It is not these that created or can keep them agoing a single year. It is the Christian Church, however disowned, that backs these performers in their several parts, and historical traditional Christianity backs and sustains the Church.

I anticipate the plea that may be urged against the position I here assume. Once yield to tradition, it may be said, and you place yourself at the mercy of tradition; you become a debtor to all the past, you render yourself liable to all the superstitions and irrationalities that have ever worn the pretence of orthodoxy; you sink into a weak Bibliolatry, or you let go your hold of Protestantism, and land in the Church of Rome. I deny that any such conclusion is deducible from my position in theory, or is likely to flow from it in fact. I am far enough from counselling a blind and unqualified surrender to tradition, or any renunciation of reason in religion. Tradition is one factor, and Reason is another; they are not antagonistic, but complementary the one of the other.

There is, and must be, in all religion an element of faith, a region of the indemonstrable, unaccountable; for this it is which specifically distinguishes religion from science. Its office is communion with that for which reason in its proper and legitimate function does not suffice. There is also in religion a right of reason, as the counterpoise and corrective of faith, which, without that corrective, tends to boundless superstition and wild disorder. The practical principle here is very obvious. Things which contradict reason are not to be confounded with things which transcend reason. We are bound in wisdom to accept some things which reason alone could never discover and perhaps can never establish, but cannot disprove,—a region of the unaccountable, if you please so to call it, of the preternatural. We are equally bound in wisdom *not* to accept what reason not only does not perceive and cannot legitimate, but emphatically contradicts, —doctrines which outrage reason and the moral sense.

And as to any supposed danger that respect for tradition and resting in faith may lead to Romanism, the facts with us are the other way. Nothing is more notorious

than that the converts to Romanism in this country have been mostly recruits from the number of those who had held the most radical and negative views in theology.

The interest of reason and the interest of faith are not contrary, but, rightly understood, essentially one. The office of both is to bring us acquainted with the truth. Faith does this in the way of anticipation, reason in the way of insight. The one is wings to the soul, the other eyes. Faith furnishes the motive power, Reason the method; one the material, the other the form. Without faith the world would have had to this day no idea of God. Without reason, that idea would have been to this day a chimera and a fright, or a barren ecstasy.

If reason in our time is more active than faith, it is because it concerns us more at present to apprehend than to dream, and, so far as may be, to adjust the life of the spirit with the intellectual demands of a scientific age. And if the application of reason to religion by modern critics has operated with disturbing, and, to some extent, with destructive effect, it has operated also with awakening power. I cannot doubt that the critical movement of our time will finally inure in a better understanding and a better use of Christian truth. One good it has already accomplished for those who have followed its course and possessed themselves of its most assured and established results. It has purged traditional Christianity of falsifications and corruptions, and, by clearing its Scriptures of spurious additaments and interpolations and misinterpretations, has brought out the primitive sense and original genius of the Gospel.

After all the pruning and the sifting to which competent and conscientious criticism has subjected the records, enough remains to furnish documentary proof of the reception, in the first century of our era, of the principal facts and ideas which make the substance of the Christian faith. There is much in these remains which science cannot verify, nor the understanding adjust with known laws and universal experience, but which sound criticism must nevertheless accept, in substance, if not in form, as historic truth. This, it seems to me, is the only legitimate ground which a preacher of the Gospel can take in relation to its record.

I believe in a progressive theology, but the method of that progress is a point to be considered. No progress comes of mere negation. It is easy to deny, to thrust aside an improbable statement or unpalatable doctrine. But this does not help us one step forward; it leaves us, theologically, precisely where we were before. If the statement or doctrine be a genuine constituent of Christian tradition, the first step is to understand it, the next to separate the substance from the form, to assimilate and reproduce the one while dismissing the other. For when we talk of progressive theology, we do not mean a progress out of theology by simple denial, but a progress in it. True progress comes by development alone; or rather, progress consists in development. And development supposes, instead of an abrupt renunciation of the old, an unbroken and organic connection with it. Whosoever would build permanently must build on the past; he must take the foundation which is given him in the institutions and ideas of the Church, whose offspring he is. He must graft himself on the old stock, and know that he bears not the root, but the root him. It is easy, I say, to deny; a small modicum of talent is required to assail and repudiate existing beliefs. But the true reformer accepts existing beliefs, and unfolds the truth that is in them into new and nobler forms of faith. The most radical reform the world has ever known is Christianity. But radical as it proved in its final operation, Christianity at the start did not break with the past. While protesting against Jewish formalism, and proclaiming a worship in spirit and truth, it respected Jewish ideas; its arguments were drawn from the Jewish law; its ordinances were founded on Jewish rites; its author took upon himself the burden of the prophets and the promised Messiah. He linked his mission with Moses and Elias, and claimed to hold of the ancient sacred stock. He rooted himself in the dear old sanctities of Judaism, and grounded his kingdom on its traditionary hopes. "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Cosmopolite Christianity was but the fulfilment of provincial Judaism. This is the way in which all religious reform must proceed, to obtain a permanent foothold in the world. It is by fulfilment, not by destruction, that we really outgrow the past, that theology

outgrows the crude conceptions of an earlier age. Development is God's method in the education of the race. Whatever in religion is destined to endure, must be the offspring of the past. It must be related to the old by natural descent. It must come as Christianity came, by providential agencies springing from the bosom of the Church and working in its name, and not by come-outers acting on the Church from without. All the reformers of the Church hitherto, all who have contributed anything effectual to correct its errors, to enlarge its views, to quicken its zeal,—Luther, Fox, Swedenborg, Wesley, Channing,—have been disciples and preachers of that faith which they have helped to new-mould and reform.

The religious education of the human race cannot deny its lineage. There is a line of Divine communication along which the spiritual progress of mankind has advanced thus far. Whatever of truth and Divine authority is to come, whatever is destined to act with enduring and beneficent effect on the moral and religious condition of the world, will spring from this root and fall in with this line, and whatever appears in opposition to it will finally be absorbed in it, or perish from the world.

One thing more. The prime condition of progress in theology, as in everything else, is conscientious love of truth. This may seem a superfluous caution, as addressed to preachers of the Gospel,—as if one should counsel gentlemen of breeding and honourable rank to abstain from petty larceny. But experience has taught me that love of truth, in the sense I intend, is a very rare quality in preachers of the Gospel. I have known many religious, many devout, many pure livers, many faithful and devoted Christians, but very few whom I could credit with entire intellectual sincerity, few who seemed to me actuated by a sole desire for the truth. Kant has remarked, that, although truthfulness is the least we ask of any reputable character, it is precisely the quality "to which human nature is least inclined." It is rare in all the professions, it is especially rare in theology. Most theologians have some ulterior interest, some theory or creed or prejudice, some cause to which they are unwittingly bound, in the spirit of which they speak, in the spirit of which they investigate or refuse to investigate,

and which predetermines all their conclusions. When the committee who presented the Oxford Declaration congratulate themselves on having promoted the glory of God by limiting his saving mercy, they betray a lurking hope of salvation by orthodoxy,—a mean and self-contradictory expectation of purchasing the favour of God by extolling its exclusiveness; much in the same way that the subjects of an Oriental despot seek the favour of their sovereign by magnifying the terror of his name. On the other hand, the radical theologian, who adopts a canon of criticism which eliminates without discrimination whatever in the Gospel record the understanding cannot verify or experience match, commits the absurdity of supposing that the ways of the Infinite must be commensurate with our ways, that the human understanding is a gauge of the possibilities of God.

Give me the theologian whose only aim is to see distinctly and to say what he sees. Criticism is indispensable, but faith is equally so; and the only way in which theology can advance to new and more adequate solution of its problems, is by the joint action of both these factors,—each supplying what the other lacks, both guided and determined by an all-controlling love of truth.

GOD'S ANVIL.

PAIN's furnace heat within me quivers,
God's breath upon the flame doth blow,
And all my heart in anguish shivers,
And trembles at the fiery glow;
And yet I whisper—as God will!
And, in his hottest fire, hold still.

He comes and lays my heart all heated,
On the hard anvil, minded so
Into his own fair shape to beat it
With his great hammer, blow on blow;
And yet I whisper—as God will!
And at his heaviest blows, hold still.

He takes my softened heart and beats it,
The sparks fly off at every blow,
He turns it o'er and o'er, and beats it,
And lets it cool, and makes it glow;
And yet I whisper—as God will!
And in his mighty hand, hold still.

Why should I murmur? for the sorrow
Thus only longer-lived would be;
Its end will come, and may to-morrow,
When God has done his work in me;
So I say, trusting—as God will!
And trusting to the end, hold still.

He kindles for my profit purely
Affliction's gloomy, fiery brand,
And all his heaviest blows are surely
Inflicted by a Master hand;
So I say, praying—as God will!
And hope in him, and suffer still.

J. Sturm.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. III.—RALOO.

(*Continued from p.* 21.)

Mr. Kelso's ministry at Raloo was very soon hampered by the discouragement which in those days unfavourably affected the labours of most Presbyterian ministers, viz., want of maintenance. In less than three months after his ordination, *i.e.*, on August 12, 1673, appeared at a meeting of the brethren in Larne several persons from Raloo, stating that they were few in number, and that many of their number had fallen poor, and so that they were unable to perform to their minister what they had engaged to the meeting (viz., £20 per annum). Nevertheless, the meeting understanding Mr. Kelso to be much neglected, did lay it upon the "bondsmen" (*i.e.*, the persons who were security to the minister for the stipend) to take some effectual course for satisfying him for bygones and encouraging him for the future, and to give a report of their diligence to the next meeting. At the next

meeting, held also in Larne, on September 2, 1673, appeared one from Raloo signifying their wish to give the meeting satisfaction as to their paying what they were in arrear with their minister (which proves, I think, that Mr. Kelso must have laboured amongst them some considerable time before he was ordained), and also providing him a competency for the time to come. The brethren appointed some of them from that parish to attend the next meeting with a satisfactory answer to their desire relating to Mr. Robert Kelso. With this appointment the people of Raloo do not seem to have complied, for under date November 11, 1673, it is stated that "in regard none appear from Raloo to give any account of their duty to their minister, the meeting appoints Mr. John Haltridge (of Islandmagee) to write a letter to the inhabitants of Raloo, "resenting their slighting of the meeting's appointment, and requiring them to give a full account to the next meeting." Thus appealed to, the Raloo people seem to have bestirred themselves a little in this matter, but still not so much as they ought to have done. For on January 6, 1674, appeared at Larne Matthew Lyle from the Parish of Raloo, with a letter wherein "a lame report" was given of that people's performance to their minister as to maintenance. The meeting expressed itself dissatisfied, both with the letter and with the encouragement their minister had among them, and therefore appointed Mr. Robert Paton (of Ballyclare) to go thither on a week-day and preach, and after sermon deal with that people to be more encouraging to their pastor, and report his diligence to the next meeting. Various circumstances delayed Mr. Paton's compliance with this appointment, so that it was not until March 7, 1674, that he gave in his report, which was by letter, and not favourable. He informed the brethren that he had gone to Raloo, "and found Mr. Kelso under great discouragement in that place." The result was fatal to Mr. Kelso's continued connexion with Raloo; for "the meeting, having warned the principal men of Raloo to appear before them to give an account of their performance to Mr. Kelso, with notification that if they would not appear, and show some clear way for their minister's satisfaction and encouragement, the meeting would be necessitated to declare him

transportable; and having called them from time to time for four or five meetings, and they not appearing, and Mr. Kelso laying out his case to be insupportable in that place, at last appeared two men (whose names are not given) who said that a number more were appointed to be at the meeting, but had not come; and these (being of the most sober and judicious of that parish) being pressed why the rest appeared not, they said they conceived (as the truth was) that the people were convinced of their utter incapacity to maintain a minister, and therefore thought it needless to appear for that end; and being pressed anent Mr. Kelso's transportability, they acknowledge (though they would be most willing to maintain him among them) that as things stand with them, they see no probability of his subsistence amongst them, and therefore cannot in conscience oppose it. From all which the meeting were necessitated to grant Mr. Kelso an act of transportability from that place; which act accordingly passed, declaring him free to embrace a call to any other charge when it should be offered to him, and this was intimated both to Mr. Kelso and the aforesaid parishioners, desiring them to acquaint the people with it."* Mr. Kelso seems to have lost no time in availing himself of this license of "transportability," and to have forthwith "transported" himself from Raloo, going first of all to the "Laggan," a district in the North-West of Ireland, and afterwards to Wicklow, where he resided for some time as a minister. Here, therefore, the history of the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Raloo abruptly termi-

* If it should be thought that in the foregoing entries the shortcomings of the Raloo people, with regard to their minister, are detailed at unnecessary length, it is to be remembered that that minister was Clerk of the meeting, and therefore compiled the minutes. In doing so he may have been anxious, for his own justification, to state in all their force the circumstances which led to his removal from Raloo; but the brethren seem to have thought that he had recorded congregational deficiencies with somewhat too much minuteness; for one of the first entries made in the minutes by his successor to the clerkship (Mr. Robert Henry, of Carrickfergus) is in the following effect:—"Here the reader or viewer of this book is to consider that in the filling it up out of the first draft of the minutes, it was thought fit not to insert in the book a particular account of what was done in many meetings after this, in reference to the remedying of the grievances of brethren in point of their respective congregations in performing the duty of maintenance."

nates;* but I may be allowed here to set down some particulars in the subsequent history of Mr. Kelso—its first minister—which are rather interesting. That gentleman, as I have stated, settled in Wicklow after leaving Raloo; which he did towards the end of 1674. In the December minute of that year, reference is made to a letter from Mr. Kelso to this meeting, asking for advice as to his settling in Wicklow, and also to a letter from the people of Wicklow on the same subject, both of which were ordered to be answered "according to Mr. Kelso's desire." But the Wicklow settlement seems to have turned out not much more favourably than Raloo had done; for on July 15, 1685, the brethren of the Antrim meeting make the following entry in their minutes: "We refer the further consideration of Mr Kelso's necessitous condition till next meeting, and whereas he has writ hither about his leaving that place where he has settled in Wicklow, giving some reasons therefor which are to be referred further next to meeting." Accordingly at the next meeting, on August 13, 1685, the brethren appointed the Clerk "to give Mr. Kelso three pounds, and to write to him in the meeting's name and shew their sympathy with him." Nor did they weary in well-doing towards a former brother; for on June 7, 1687, it is again stated that "Mr. Robert Kelso was writ to by the Clerk according to appointment." Shortly after this latter date Mr. Kelso must have again "transported" himself from an inhospitable settlement; for in the eventful year 1688 we find him minister in Enniskillen, where he did the State some service. Captain William M'Cormick, in his "Impartial Account of the Actions of the Inniskilling Men" (London, 1691), states that "Mr.

* From some entries in the old minute-book subsequently to Mr. Kelso's "transportation," I am sorry to say it appears that the Raloo people allowed him to go away without their paying him his just debts. "MAY 4, 1675.—A case was proposed by Mr. Hall (of Larne) concerning the people of Raloo, who desire sealing ordinances. The meeting allows Mr. Hall to admit only such of them as do promise to make address unto the next meeting for their settling with Mr. Kelso, and withal that he admonish them concerning their deficiency to their late minister." And at the following meeting Mr. Hall signified that some from Raloo promised to wait upon the next meeting, in reference to their settlement with Mr. Kelso; but whether they kept their word, or what they finally did in the matter, cannot now be ascertained, owing to an unfortunate gap in the minutes.

Kelso laboured both publicly and privately in animating his hearers to take up arms and stand upon their own defence, shewing example himself by wearing arms and marching at the head of them when together." Accordingly, as we are told on the same authority, of the two companies into which the inhabitants of Enniskillen formed themselves at this trying juncture, "the majority consisted of Non-Conformists, as they term them,—that party effectually espousing our interest, and never declining us in the most dangerous times. Mr. Kelso, the Non-Conformist minister, was also appointed, with a certain number of officers, to sit in council every day to consider what measures were most proper to pursue for our preservation;" and in this capacity he wrote the following touching letter to his brother-in-arms, Mr. Cairnes, of Derry, informing their brethren in the Maiden City of their critical circumstances, and entreating their counsel and co-operation:—

"Enniskillen, *Dec.* 15, 1688.

"Sir,—After an alarm of an intended massacre, there are two foot companies sent to be quartered in this small place; and though we be deserted by our magistrates, yet we intend to repulse them. You are therefore entreated, in this common cause, to look on our condition, and, if we come to be made a leading card, sit not still and see us sink. The bearer can more fully inform you of our condition. The Lord direct and preserve you and us, who intend hurt to none, but sinless self-preservation. This from yours,

"Robert Kelso."

The sturdy Presbyterians of Enniskillen were as good as their word. Supported by a company of horsemen, composed of the Protestant tenantry of Major Gustavus Hamilton, they boldly attacked, a few days afterwards, the Romish companies on their march towards the town, and completely routed them. Mr. Kelso died in his charge at Enniskillen, shortly after the Siege of Derry.*

* The reader will be surprised to hear that "in the actions of the Enniskillen men, written by Andrew Hamilton, Rector of Kilskeery, an eye-witness and actor therein," which was first published in 1690, and which was presented by its author to King William and Queen Mary, not the slightest mention is made of Mr. Kelso, the minister of Enniskillen, as having done anything for the common cause. I fear that at this time the secret jealousy between the Presbyterian and Episcopalian Protestants was very great. In Derry it undeniably was so, as shewn in the unseemly controversy between Walker and Mackenzie. In fact neither party had in 1688 forgotten 1661.

(*To be continued.*)

NARRATIVES FROM REAL LIFE.

J——, THE EARTHENWARE MAN.

In the town of T—— there lived a man who, in his youth, had been so wicked, and such a trouble to his friends, that they caused him to be seized by a press-gang to get rid of him. He possessed great bodily strength—few men being equal to him—and was not without some ability and education; but he had not the fear of God before his eyes, and he lived quite without Him in the world. After some years he returned to his native place, but not at all altered in character; sin of every kind was his delight, and several times it led him to prison. At length he married, and, with some prize-money he had obtained, set up an earthenware shop. Few, however, would have anything to do with him; and so notorious was his character for wickedness, that no sooner was any wickedness done in the town than J—— was suspected of it.

Years passed by, when I was one day surprised by a visit from J——'s mother, who came in great distress of mind to tell me that her son was dying of consumption, but in a very hardened state; that the Calvinists had tried what they could do with him, but without effect, and had therefore given him up as one of the reprobate, doomed to destruction; that all religious instruction appeared to be lost upon him, but that if I would come and make the attempt, she should feel thankful and satisfied. From what she said, I feared my visiting him would be useless; however, I promised her I would go.

On calling at his house, I found him in a more hardened state than I had ever witnessed any one before. For a long time he would neither speak to me nor hear what I had to say, but turned his face to the wall, and at length covered his head with the bed-clothes. I was quite disheartened, and rose two or three times to leave the room, Resolved, however, to make one more effort, and observing that one of his hands was outside the bed clothes, I gently pressed it within my own, and said, "My brother!" This simple action, with the few moments' silence that followed it, appeared to have subdued him. I heard

him sobbing underneath the bed-clothes, and at length he cast them off, and said, in a sorrowful tone, "Ah! I am no brother of yours." "My friend," I replied, "sinner as thou hast been, thou art still a brother; we are the children of our heavenly Father!" I found I had reached his heart. He no longer refused to attend to me; and, after some further conversation, I read to him the parable of the Prodigal Son. While I was reading, he became deeply affected, and repeatedly cried out, "Oh what a prodigal *I* have been!" Before I came away, at his request I prayed with him, and he entreated me to come again. He lived several weeks after this, during which time I frequently visited him, sometimes taking religious friends with me, who advised and encouraged him, and we had the satisfaction of seeing the work of penitence go on until he possessed an humble hope in the mercy of God. There was one thing, however, which, as long as he lived, filled him with bitter remorse—the bad example he had given his children—and which, he feared, would be more influential with them than his present change. For himself, he felt perfectly willing to bear whatever sufferings his Heavenly Father should appoint, but for the consequences of his former life to his children he trembled greatly. On some occasions, when I visited him, he conversed with me of his travels, and particularly of Egypt and the Holy Land, where, it appeared, he had spent some time; but the immediate interests of religion were more frequently before us. A few days before he died, as I was about to go from home for a short time, I went to take leave of him. I found him supported by pillows, giving advice to his little girl, and on my bidding him farewell, he threw his arms round my neck with the warmest affection. He was, however, alive on my return; and on my inquiring how he did, he replied—"Happy, very happy. I have, in my wanderings in the Holy Land, looked down from a hill on the city of Jerusalem, and a glorious sight it was to behold; but now I can see the heavenly city, the New Jerusalem above. I have sat by the side of Jacob's Well, and have drank of its pure and refreshing water; but now I can sit by the well of salvation, and drink therefrom of the water of life." Soon after this his

speech failed; and, after lying quietly for some hours, during which he appeared frequently to be engaged in prayer, he expired. I think nearly his last words were, "I am a poor prodigal come to himself, and going home to his Father's house."

Some time since I was requested by one of our friends to visit a young woman who was very ill, and had expressed a strong desire to see me. I went immediately. I found the poor girl far gone in consumption, not in much bodily pain, but anxiously concerned for her spiritual welfare. I had no recollection at first of ever having seen her before; but being struck with the name of J—— which was given, "What!" said I, "are you a daughter of J——, the earthenware man, whom I visited during his last illness many years ago?" "Yes, sir," she replied, "I am that girl who used to behave so unruly, and was such a trouble to you when you came to see him. But, thoughtless and ignorant though I was, still I could not help sometimes listening to what you said, and much of it I never forgot. It is that which has made me so desirous to see you, and I hope you will come and pray and talk with me as you did with my father. I feel that I am not long for this world; life is passing away from me very fast; and though I bitterly lament over my past sins, and humbly cherish a hope of God's mercy through Jesus Christ, which I have derived from the Bible, still I want a more firm and lively trust; I want more resignation and faith; and oh, sir! do come and talk with me; God may bless your words, and make you instrumental in promoting my eternal good." I assured her I would see her as often as I was able, for which she expressed great thankfulness. I found that for nearly twelve months before her illness she had been an attendant at our chapel, and that she had derived benefit from the services.

For some time before I visited her, the work of religion had been going on in her heart. She was not, therefore, ignorant of divine things; but still she needed Christian sympathy and direction. My visits to her, therefore, although in one sense melancholy ones, were not cheerless and unsatisfactory. Her soul panted after

heaven, and she wrestled earnestly with God in prayer that he would mercifully pardon her sins, and give to her the tokens of his love.

On visiting her one day shortly before her death, I found her asleep. I entered the room softly, and sat down near the bed. On a little table by the bedside was her Bible. It was opened; and, on looking at the place where she was reading, I saw it was the fifteenth chapter of St. Luke, which contains the parable of the Prodigal Son,—the parable which first arrested the attention of her father. Anxious that the dying girl, now wasted to a mere skeleton, should not be disturbed, I quietly waited for some time. The silence of the sick chamber was broken only by the difficulty with which she drew her breath. As her mother and myself sat by her bedside, we heard her pray softly in her sleep. It was in broken sentences, and in reference to the parable she had been reading. We heard her say—"a hired servant!—make me as one of thy hired servants, Lord!"

She did not live long afterwards. Just before she departed, she stretched out her wasted arms, and looking at them for awhile, cried with a loud voice,—"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, though my reins be consumed within me!" These were her last words; immediately she sank back on her pillow, and ceased to breathe.

"And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."—Rev. xiv. 13.

The church is important only as it ministers to purity of heart and life; and every church which so ministers is a good one; no matter how, when, or where it grew up; no matter whether it worship on its knees, or on its feet, or whether its ministers are ordained by pope, bishop, presbyter, or people; these are secondary things, and of no comparative moment.

REVIEW.

THE REFORM OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN WORSHIP, GOVERNMENT, AND DOCTRINE. By ROBERT LEE, D.D., *Minister of Greyfriars, Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Edinburgh, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary in Scotland.* Part I., *Worship.* Edinburgh, Edmonston & Douglas, 1864. 196 pp. 8vo.

[SECOND NOTICE.]

BESIDES the reasons stated or suggested in a previous number for the use, partial or exclusive, of a liturgy in Presbyterian worship, Dr. Lee adds the following, which seems to be worthy of particular attention. He says,—

"Without some authoritative form of worship, a church has no standard of doctrine, nor any profession or confession of faith, so far at least as the *people* are concerned. Confessions of faith, as we employ them, are merely standards for the clergy, to regulate their teachings, or to ascertain or fix their opinions on theological dogmas, many of which are of a speculative character, and a great proportion of which never are, and some of which never should be, made subjects of sermons. But the liturgy is a Confession of Faith to all who join in it, laity no less than clergy. According to this rule, and in these words, they pray and praise. And whatever they may think, men are of one religion and of one faith when they can heartily join together in the same prayers. The liturgy, therefore, is the real Confession of Faith, nor can the church have any other for all its members. It may also be doubted whether it needs any other even for its minister, and also whether without this, any body can, properly speaking, be a church at all. It was noted as a fatal defect in the Westminster Directory that it 'recited no creed.' Probably every writer on this subject, of whatever age, country, or sect, is agreed that the reciting of a creed is indispensable on every occasions of public worship or common prayer; and this is so essential in the administration of the sacraments in particular that without it these ordinances cannot be regarded as performed in a regular, legitimate, and proper manner."—Pp. 184, 185.

What follows is equally true, and has had many illustrations in our own day:—

"It appears to me also that the want of all liturgical forms is one of the chief reasons of that singular want of adherence, and of that disastrous tendency to separation, which have so remarkably distinguished Presbyterians during the last two hundred years; *i.e.*

ever since the Book of Common Order was laid aside. The explanation is very obvious. In our worship *the church* is not in any way represented. The minister is all in all. He does or directs everything. So that if the minister happen to be a person distinguished for talents, acquirements, eloquence, or taste, these distinctions do not in any way redound to the aggrandizement or credit of the church, but rather the contrary; for his hearers naturally consider such a person as an exception to the general average of his brethren, and accordingly, where such ministers secede, the bulk of their congregations naturally secede with them. This is the almost universal rule, and it is easily explained. In adhering to their minister, they adhere to the only church which practically they either love or admire, or in fact know anything about."—Pp. 185, 186.

In corroboration of the foregoing remarks, and as shewing the use of a liturgy in keeping a church together, we cannot avoid expressing our opinion that it is only the Book of Common Prayer which, in our own day, has prevented the Church of England from flying into a thousand pieces, as any non-liturgical church would undoubtedly have done, under the operation of the disruptive causes to which the English Church has lately been subjected.

Before proceeding to describe the *form* in which public prayer should be offered by a congregation, Dr. Lee makes a few remarks on the *posture* which should be adopted by the worshippers. On this point he allows its full force to the argument from expediency; and in deference to this consideration, as well as to the practice of the majority of Christian churches, ancient and modern, maintains, and we think rightly maintains, that congregations should kneel to pray, and should stand up to sing. The propriety of these positions we think only the purest Presbyterian prejudice will deny. Indeed even Knox's Book of Common Order, as quoted by Dr. Lee (p. 167), distinctly recognizes the custom of kneeling at prayer, for it calls upon the congregation, not to stand up, but, in deference to the command which requires "all knees to bow before our Lord Jesus Christ," invites them "humbly to fall down before him, and in this manner pray."

The substance of the prayer, however, is of more importance than the posture of the supplicant; and on this point Dr. Lee has the following truly liberal remarks, on what he thinks should be the characteristics of any form

of public worship which should be recommended or adopted for general use in the present day. He says,—

"A form of worship adapted to our wants and suitable for our times, should be simpler in its structure; less theological and dogmatical, and more religious and spiritual, than any either of the patristic or reformed rites—not to say that it must eschew their superstitions and their intolerance, both of which are sometimes grievous. It should exhibit forbearance and charity; should make nothing essential which the New Testament does not make so; should be content to set forth the doctrines, especially the mysteries of our holy faith, as much as may be, in the language in which the Scriptures themselves set them forth; and should not presume to know more, or to speak more confidently, or emphatically, or practically, than our Lord and his Apostles have seen fit to speak; so that all men who profess the Christian faith may be able to join in it, notwithstanding many, and even wide differences of opinion among themselves respecting the manner in which Christian doctrines and mysteries are to be explained. . . . . Whenever any ecclesiastical body so contracts itself as to assume the position and character of a sect, it denudes itself by so doing of the character and legitimate position of a national church, which must aim at being as comprehensive as possible, and exclude nothing that can, by a candid and liberal interpretation, be considered Christian.

"After all, the language of Scripture is for this purpose the best; the simplest, the purest, the truest; and also for us the most venerable and impressive. It comes to our minds with a weight and solemnity which no other language has, or can have; and therefore, I cannot help thinking that the prayers, as well as the praises of the church, should not only be framed upon that model, but should consist in great measure of well chosen expressions from that great magazine of divine wisdom, grace, and love. The ideas should be Scriptural; so should be the manner of thought and expression; and all this may be attained without making prayers nothing but a string of quotations from the Bible. . . . . I cannot tell whether the General Assembly will take any action in this important matter at present; certain I am that if the church is to keep her footing, it must be attempted, and that at no distant day."—Pp. 187—189.

In our opinion, other Presbyterian Churches, as well as the Church of Scotland, lie under a similar necessity in this matter. We may also mention—what Dr. Lee's modesty prevents him from doing—that he has himself compiled and published a work containing several forms for public worship, and the administration of the sacraments, which is used in his own and other congregations, and which entirely fulfils the description above given of a simple and Scriptural liturgy.

Respecting "the arrangement of public worship," Dr.

Lee has a chapter which will well repay perusal. He begins it by stating that "the order in which the different acts of worship should succeed each other is a matter of great importance, though among us it has received very little attention, or rather none at all;" and he proceeds to observe:—

"The different acts which compose the service should support each other, so to speak; and the whole will be seen, or rather felt, to constitute one organic whole, in which there is nothing superfluous on the one hand, nor on the other any thing wanting or defective. Let us not disguise the matter: a good church service is a work of art—as a good sermon is—and they who imagine they can produce either without thought, labour, and skill, have either a very exalted idea of their own abilities, or a very mean conception of what they are called to do. No doubt 'it is the Spirit that quickeneth;' but the Spirit quickens and blesses those who use and improve His gifts, and leaves those who are negligent and slothful to unfruitfulness and reproof. . . . . The Catholic mode of beginning public worship is generally with a Psalm. The Reformed or Presbyterian mode is different, and is formed upon a rather different order of ideas; namely, that the first act in the service shall be a solemn admonition or call — something to solemnize our hearts, and to remind us where we are, and what we are about to do; or, as a learned divine of our Church once expressed it, 'the first word should come from God.' . . . This solemn invitation should evidently be followed by prayer, and, I suppose it will not be doubted that prayer should be succeeded by praise. Thus the three acts of worship are complete—the Word, prayer, praise; and they constitute the first part of the service. The reading of the Old Testament naturally opens the second part of the services; it is followed by the second prayer, and by praise; and the reading of the New Testament begins the third part of the service, followed by the third prayer and by praise. This completes the *worship* in the strict sense of the word. The sermon comes after, followed by an appropriate prayer, the whole concluding with a doxology."—Pp. 180-2.

This proposed arrangement Dr. Lee defends by several cogent considerations, including amongst others the seasonable respites which it gives the minister during the course of a lengthened service; and he concludes this part of his subject by saying:—

"To some these may appear small matters, and unworthy of serious study; but nothing should be esteemed small or trivial which concerns the propriety, beauty, solemnity, and impressiveness of divine worship in the assemblies of the saints."—P. 183.

With respect to "worship," properly so called, there is only one other point, as suggested by Dr. Lee's work, to

which we would refer. Our author very properly maintains that in every act of public worship (we would even extend the observation to private worship) the prayer of prayers—the Lord's prayer—should statedly and distinctly be recited. In saying this, Dr. Lee rebukes what he admits to have been the egregious and unseemly error in this matter of the ministers of his own Church, who, for many years, pointedly excluded this beautiful prayer from their religious services, professedly because the stated repetition of it savoured of Popery, but really because the fact of our blessed Saviour's having expressly taught this "form" of prayer to his disciples settled the entire question as to the lawfulness of prescribed "forms of prayer," and settled it against *them*.

The volume now before us treats of some other matters connected with the services of the sanctuary, to which we can only very briefly allude. With respect to Psalms and Hymns, Dr. Lee does not at all allege that the Psalms of David have any valid claim to the exclusive occupation of this department of divine worship; but, at the same time, he very strongly, and, in our opinion, very justly, condemns what he calls "our modern, sentimental, puling Hymns." He thinks that all Psalms and Hymns should be Scriptural, in sentiment if not in expression; and in this connexion he quotes several passages from the Old and New Testaments as being adapted to serve the purposes of "acts of praise," which are not regarded in that point of view by the majority of readers. On the subject of Psalmody our author not only highly approves of instrumental music being employed in the public worship of God, but also maintains generally that in all departments "the beautiful in art and nature is as likely to make men holy as are ugliness and meanness, the ignorance and rudeness of barbarism, filthy and uncomfortable churches, such as were general in this country not long ago, and the wild screaming which was miscalled music, but which did nothing towards bringing people into harmony either with God, their neighbours, or themselves." Dr. Lee further thinks that the reading of stated portions of sacred Scripture, both from the Old and the New Testament, should invariably form a part of the public services of the temple. In this matter also he

rebukes the former practice of the ministers of his own Church, most of whom totally omitted, in their Sunday services, the reading of lessons from Scripture; and he, in like manner, condemns the other practice, which is not yet entirely extinct, of interlarding the Word of God (when it is read at all) "with comments and explanations, as if the clergy feared to let the Word speak for itself, and teach its own lessons."

In regard to special services and Christian festivals our author's views are equally just and liberal with those already quoted. He says—

"The time has perhaps come when it may be proper seriously to inquire whether there be any good reason why we should not celebrate such festivals as Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whit Sunday, with all or nearly all our Christian brethren over the whole world."—P. 191.

And again—

"For my part, I cannot see that any damage would be done if, in all our churches, we had public worship on those five days, or at least upon Christmas Day and Good Friday."—P. 193.

As to Communion Services, Dr. Lee's notions appear to us to be singularly judicious. In one passage he speaks in no complimentary terms of "the endless preachings and insufferable tediousness that have so long afflicted the Church in the dispensation of the Lord's Supper" (pp. 167, 168); and in another passage he makes a suggestion with respect to the celebration of the Christian ordinance, which, in our opinion, is well worthy of serious consideration. He thinks

"There would be considerable convenience in our celebrating the Lord's Supper, all over Scotland, upon Easter Sunday, and making Good Friday the fast-day for the whole country. This would make the fast-day virtually a Sunday for the whole community, and people would universally cease from their business, and also from their pleasure—as much, at least, as they do on Sundays. Our fast days are becoming quite a scandal, and some remedy must be found, and that speedily."—P. 193.

To this proposal Dr. Lee anticipates an objection which, in his mind, would rather be a recommendation. He says—

"A simultaneous communion all over the country would, of course, prevent ministers assisting each other at the Sacrament.

But this is one of the strongest arguments in favour of such a reform; for thus the people would be delivered from the grievous burden of so many 'preaching days,' and also from the intolerable sermons, styled Table Services, of Sacrament Sundays. Each minister, being compelled to perform the whole service himself, would at last come to understand that one man commonly is able to speak as long as men in general are able to listen, and often much longer; and that a service which is too much for the minister's lungs, is far too much for the people's patience, piety, or profit in any way. A Communion Service five or six hours long would soon come among us to be reckoned as irrational, unedifying, and preposterous, as it is esteemed by all mankind besides. . . . A change is inevitable; would it not be best to make it at once, and so anticipate dissatisfaction?"—Pp. 193, 194.

This, in our opinion, is judicious counsel. "A word spoken in due season, how good is it!" On the whole, we strongly recommend this volume by Dr. Lee to the careful study of those persons who may be disposed to speculate as to what, in the course of a few years, will be the shape and form of the Presbyterian Churches of these countries. We apprehend that in shape and form —whatever they may be in substance—these Churches will be in many respects different from what they are in the present day.

We await with anxiety the appearance of Dr. Lee's second and third volumes, wherein he is to consider the reform of the Church of Scotland in government and doctrine. Z.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE REV. JOHN SHANNON AND THE UNITARIAN CONGREGATION OF HULL.

The Rev. John Shannon having resigned the pastoral charge of the Congregation of Hull, after a ministry of nineteen years, his friends have availed themselves of the occasion to present him with a testimonial in recognition of his faithful ministrations for so long a period. Mr. Shannon commenced his ministry in Hull in February, 1846, and performed the duties of his office with much fidelity and success: while he has enjoyed the esteem of his Congregation, his labours have earned for him the respect of a large number of his fellow-townsmen. On Sunday, January 29, a purse of one hundred guineas and a time-piece were presented to him in the vestry before morning service, accompanied with a suitable address. It had been intended that the presentation should be made at a congregational meeting, but the sudden death of H. Blundell, Esq., J.P., a leading and valued member of the Church, interfered with the arrange-

ments. Mr. Shannon made a brief reply, and also acknowledged the gift from the pulpit. He heartily thanked them for their kind and valuable presents,—valuable in themselves, but a hundredfold more so as a token of affection—a recognition of his services, and an expression of their good wishes for the future. A feeling of sadness came over him when he adverted to the reason for their having abandoned the idea of a public presentation. An old member of the Congregation—one who had been universally esteemed in the town, and who had felt a warm interest in their congregational prosperity—had been suddenly snatched from them by the hand of death. He was thus reminded that the majority of those who greeted him on his arrival nineteen years ago, were now laid in the silent dust. During the last few weeks he had received from many testimonies to the value of his Sunday services, and to the influence they had had, with the divine blessing, in awakening and cherishing the divine life in their hearts. Such testimonies made him feel that he had not altogether laboured in vain, nor spent his strength for nought.

On the following Sunday evening, Mr. Shannon preached his farewell sermon to a crowded congregation, from Acts xv. 36, "And some days after, Paul said to Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the Word of the Lord, and see how they do." In a most impressive discourse he made a personal application of the passage, by putting to the Congregation interrogations as to their state and condition, leaving them to be answered between their consciences and their God. At the close of the service, Kirke White's touching hymn, "Come, Christians! Brethren! ere we part," was sung. Many affectionate leave-takings were made in the vestry at the close.

CARTER LANE MISSION, LONDON.

The third annual meeting of the Carter Lane Mission was held on Wednesday evening, February 1st, at the Mission station, Friar Street. After tea, T. F. Gibson, Esq., was called to the chair; and among others present were the Revs. R. B. Aspland, J. C. Means, H. Ierson, T. L. Marshall, R. Spears, J. Taylor, G. Ride; Dr. Davison; and Messrs. J. Warren, LL.B.; J. Anderson, B.A.; J. N. Nettlefold, J. T. Preston, F. Nettlefold, H. Preston, T. C. Clarke, E. Nettlefold, J. E. Odgers, B.A.; I. M. Wade. I. S. Lister, J. T. Hart, S. S. Tayler, C. Hill, A Lawrence, &c. The chairman remarked that it was not to the lowest class their missionary operations should be chiefly extended. They were, he feared, at present beyond the reach of our religious and moral agencies. We should rather aim to influence that class who were beginning to co-operate among themselves, and who were making an effort to support themselves. *Co-operation*, he believed, was now to be the watchword of the working classes. We see this principle at work in all directions, from the penny bank up to the co operative store and the working men's club, and it was in this way we could best help the poor.

Mr. J. Warren read the treasurer's statement, from which it appeared that the expenditure for the past year had been £474, and

that the balance in hand was only £2 8s. 4d., being a diminution from the balance of last year of more than £60.

Mr. H. J. PRESTON, the secretary, then read the third annual report, from which the following are extracts:—

"The new premises were opened only in November, 1863. The charge to the children attending the Daily School had then been raised from 2d. to 3d. per week. A Reading-room and Lending Library had been established, various classes had been commenced, and lectures and other means of improving and interesting the residents in the neighbourhood, were contemplated. Sunday evening services were also to be conducted, in the hope of inducing those to attend Divine Worship who had hitherto manifested no interest in the ordinances of religion. It remained to be seen how far all or any of these agencies would be successful, or whether any and what other modes of action would be more suitable in the particular locality of the Mission. Simultaneously with the appointment of your Committee, the Rev. John Taylor entered upon the duties of his office as missionary, and took upon himself the superintendence and management of the different operations connected with the institution.

"Your Committee congratulate the subscribers in having obtained the services of a gentleman who has proved himself so well qualified as has Mr. Taylor to occupy the anxious and responsible situation of your missionary. By the kindness of his disposition he has won the sympathies of those for whom his ministrations are especially intended, while the Committee feel very great confidence in his discretion, and appreciate his unwearied assiduity in carrying out any object which appears likely to promote the welfare of the mission. A pleasing proof of the esteem in which Mr. Taylor is held by the regular members of the evening congregation was afforded by their presenting him with a Bible at the end of his first year's ministry, as a testimony of their personal regard for him, and of their appreciation of his services to them and their children.

"It is gratifying to your Committee to notice the great success which has attended the infant school, both on week days and Sundays. The increase in the number of children rendered it desirable to afford them the accommodation of a gallery, which has been provided at an expense of less than £7. Your committee also notice with pleasure the mothers' meetings, which are held once a week, under the careful superintendence of several ladies. At first their value seemed scarcely appreciated by the women; but the interest felt in them has gradually increased, and the number of attendants now amounts to 20.

"The report of the Sunday-School teachers enters into many details which would otherwise be noticed by your Committee. It is very gratifying to know that many persons who have been pupils in the Sunday-School entertain warm feelings of gratitude for the benefits they there received, and testify them by visiting the Mission as they have opportunity.

"It is the object of this Mission to shed a light over these dark places by educating and training the children of the poor from their earliest years, and by affording means of rational and intellectual enjoyment to those of more advanced age. Above all, it is its de-

sign to carry to the breasts and homes of those who reside within the sphere of its influence a knowledge of the great and good God as the universal Father, and of his glorious Gospel as announced and lived by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Several resolutions were passed bearing on the objects of the mission, and after a vote of thanks to the chairman the meeting separated.

ORDINATION AT NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

There was a large assemblage in the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, of the members of the congregation and their friends, on Wednesday evening, February 8, when the Revs. Daniel Berry and Joseph Smith, of the Home Missionary Board, Manchester, who had received and accepted invitations to the mission field in Northumberland and Durham, were to be ordained to their Christian labours; and some tasteful and kindly hands had lent an added grace to the handsome church of our brethren on the Tyne by placing on the communion table a number of elegant and fragrant greenhouse plants. Within the enclosure were the Rev. J. C. Street (Pastor); the Rev. W. Gaskell, and Rev. Brooke Herford, Manchester; the Rev. W. W. Robinson, Stockton; the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, Glasgow; the Rev. W. Sharman, Aberdeen; and the young missionaries. After the introductory services (conducted by Messrs. Robinson and Sharman), the charge was given by Mr. Gaskell, filled with sound and affectionate counsel, and admirably adapted to the times in which we live. Mr. Crosskey then addressed the missionaries in feeling terms, and at the close of his address gave his right hand to Mr. Berry and Mr. Smith in succession. Mr. Berry and Mr. Smith both responded in suitable terms. Their addresses were so spoken as to inspire a general sense of sympathy with the youthful speakers, and confident and prayerful hopes of their success in the sacred work to which they have dedicated their lives. Mr. Brooke Herford delivered a short discourse from Ezra i. 6—"And all they that were about them strengthened their hands"—in which the lesson of the text was ably enforced on those who had called the two missionaries to their wide and laborious sphere of duty; and the services of the night were brought to a close by Mr. Street with prayer and benediction.

There was a social meeting in the Music Hall on the following evening.

GREAT YARMOUTH.—On Thursday, 26th January, a tea meeting of the Unitarian Congregation of Great Yarmouth was held in the School-room of the Church, to welcome their new pastor, the Rev. T. H. M. Scott, lately of Wolverhapton. Sir Thomas Beevor, Bart., presided. After tea the chairman, in his own name and that of the congregation, gave a cordial welcome to the reverend gentleman, who responded in appropriate terms, expressing a hope that his flock would co-operate with him in his undertakings. The Rev. J. D. H. Smyth, of Norwich, welcomed Mr. Scott in a brief but admirable speech. Stereoscopes and books of prints helped to make the evening pass very agreeably. A vote of thanks was given to the ladies who provided the tea, to Mr. Clayton [illegible]

his efficient help, and to the chairman. The following evening the children of the Sunday and day schools were regaled with tea, cake, &c., and had a very merry time of it until nine o'clock, when Mr. Scott offered prayer, and the party broke up.

Soiree at Moneyrea.—On Tuesday evening, February 7, a soiree was held at Moneyrea, to welcome the Rev. David Thompson on his settlement as the minister of the congregation. After tea, which was served in the school-room, the company adjourned to the meeting-house, and the chair was taken by the Rev. John Jellie, of Belfast. The sentiment of "Civil and religious liberty" was introduced by the chairman, after which Mr. Thompson replied to the sentiment, proposed from the chair, of "Success and happiness to the pastor and his congregation." The Rev. John Orr spoke on "A Progressive Theology." Various other sentiments were given and responded to. During the evening several interesting readings were given by the chairman, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Fletcher, and Mr. Gill.

OBITUARY.

The Hon. Edward Everett.—This distinguished scholar and statesman died at his residence, Boston, Mass., on January 15th. He was born in Dorchester, Mass., in April, 1794. He entered Harvard College at the age of 13, and graduated with the first honors of his class. After two years of preparatory study in the Divinity School in Cambridge, he was, at the early age of 19, chosen to succeed the eloquent Buckminster, by whose death the pulpit of the Brattle Street Church, Boston, had become vacant. As a pulpit orator, Mr. Everett soon attained that distinction which he invariably acquired in every department of life which he successively occupied. While minister of Brattle Street Church, he won an extended reputation by a published defence of Christianity, called forth by an attack which was considered of much importance at the time. In 1815, being then but twenty-one years of age, he was elected Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Harvard College. Some years after, he became editor of the *North American Review*, which he soon raised from a local to a more than national reputation. In 1824, he was chosen Member of Congress, and continued ten years in the House of Representatives, where he was not only a brilliant but a hard working member. Retiring in 1835, he was for the four following years chosen governor of Massachusetts. In 1841, he was appointed minister at the Court of St. James; and on his return from England, in 1845, he was elected to the presidency of Harvard College. On the death of Mr. Webster, in 1852, Mr. Everett was appointed Secretary of State. Soon after, he was elected United States Senator, but was compelled in a year or so, from ill-health, to resign his seat. The *Boston Christian Register*, referring to this eminent scholar, statesman, and orator, says—"No school boy in the

United States but is familiar with his name. His wide range of learning, accurate knowledge of facts, and graceful eloquence, are a part of a nation's fame. He stands out as one of our greatest representative men, and he crowned a long, useful, and honourable career with a patriotic devotion and service which will place him in our historic gallery by the side of Otis, Adams, and Washington. . . . Mr. Everett was a Christian. . . . He was by nature and temperament a Conservative, and therefore clung to the opinions of the more Conservative school of Unitarians. Unlike many other public men, he was a regular attendant, both morning and afternoon, upon the sanctuary services. Living one of the busiest of lives, always assiduous in study, accomplishing an amount of work equal to the most industrious, still every Sabbath found him in his pew, a constant and considerate listener. But he gave more vital evidences of faith than in mere church-going: he aimed to conform his life to the precepts of Christ."

Dr. Andrews, Q.C.—Died, at Comber, County Down, on Feb. 20, Robert Andrews, Esq., Q.C., LL.D., aged 63 years. Dr. Andrews was a distinguished member of the Irish Bar, and was successively chairman of the Counties of Louth, Carlow, Wexford, and Donegal. He was appointed a Commissioner of Education on the resignation of the late Mr. Holmes, in 1847, and on that Board, as well as more recently in the Queen's University, he was the faithful and trusted representative of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians. In his removal, the Unitarian Church in Ireland has sustained a severe loss; for none more sincerely held, or more conscientiously or earnestly maintained its principles; every effort to promote its interests met with his ready sympathy and generous support. Dr. Andrews was distinguished in his profession not only by his great legal knowledge, but by his conscientious attention to the interests of his clients. His public life was characterised by uprightness, consistency, and liberality; while in private life, his kind and gentle disposition won the esteem and affection of a wide circle of friends. The death of such a man, at what seems to us a premature age, must be regarded as a public loss; but we should be thankful for a life so true and loving, and, gratefully cherishing the memories it has left, rest in the Christian faith, that his removal, through a lingering and painful illness, from the present scene, is but a translation to a higher and holier sphere.

Died, at Ballynahinch, on 4th February, in the 32nd year of his age, Mr. Hans Graham, a much respected inhabitant of that town. He was kind and obliging in his disposition, and abounded in acts of charity. He was a most useful and zealous member of the First Presbyterian (Unitarian) Congregation of Kilmore, and his loss is greatly felt by that worshipping society.

Died, on January 25, Anne, widow of the late John Dunville, Esq., Richmond Lodge, County Down.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] APRIL, 1865. [No. 3.

LIFE IN THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN CHURCH.

WE have always been accustomed to regard with peculiar interest the progress of our denominational faith in the United States of America. Although it was not there the first expounders and defenders of Christian Unitarianism in later days appeared, yet the writings of Clarke and Channing, of Ware and Dewey and Norton, with a host of others, not only won for our religious views an important position in their own land, but gave an impulse to them in these countries, and largely contributed to increase the number of their adherents. Particularly in the North of Ireland, the eloquent pages of Channing attracted much attention and were widely read: they presented, in new and striking forms, opinions that had been gradually taking possession of the reflecting portion of the people, and led many to avow their adoption of the Unitarian faith. To the efforts of the American Unitarian Association we are indebted for an invaluable series of Tracts in explanation and defence of Christian doctrine, and in exposition and enforcement of Christian duty; and it is deserving of remark, that these tracts are not simply pleas for the right and duty of free inquiry, or a mere negation of prevailing theological dogmas, but they embody distinct and positive statements of Christian truth, and clearly exhibit the divine authority of revelation. More recently the same Association issued a series of volumes, designed to exhibit the leading Unitarian doctrines, to enforce Chistian duties, and to foster a spirit of earnest Christian devotion. During the prevalence of the calamitous war which has for several years desolated the nation, but which seems overruled by a benign providence for the removal of that slavery which was at once

its shame and its curse, little has been done for the promotion of Unitarianism, except by the circulation of tracts and religious newspapers in the army. The drain which the war necessarily brought on the resources of the people diminished the means of the Association, while the cost of publishing was greatly increased: but it is creditable to the faith and zeal of the denomination, that before the war has yet terminated, and when it may still be protracted for months, or even years, a movement has been made to bring their religious views before the masses of the people, and do what they can to introduce them to a rational and elevating Christian faith. They calculate that there must be many minds prepared to listen with attention to any important truths that may be presented to them, and that, through the operation of the war, they may reach many districts of the country to which before they had no access; and besides, the very character of the social revolution which the war has effected is calculated to unsettle men's opinions, to uproot their prejudices, and lead them, in a broad and liberal spirit, to receive those views of the Gospel which alike vindicate the exercise of reason and the gift of revelation, the love of God and the dignity of human nature. The latest census of the nation also encourages them in their contemplated labours. The population, by the last return, was thirty-one millions, of whom less than ten millions were unconnected with any religious organization as church members; and it is reasonable to suppose that of the remaining twenty-one millions there is a large portion unsettled in their faith, or without any faith at all. Here, then, is a field "white unto the harvest," to which the labourers of our faith are invited, and to which providence and duty seem to lead them.

To consider plans for extensive missionary effort, arrangements have been made to hold a convention in New York on April 5, to which all Unitarian ministers in the country are invited, and also two lay delegates from each congregation. In the meantime, a Committee, to whom the duty was entrusted, have been considering the basis on which the new organization should rest, and thus have been thrown up the grounds of controversy which have recently prevailed in these countries. It

could not be expected that the land in which Theodore Parker preached and wrote and laboured would be without many minds to sympathise in his views, or that the country which has been distinguished for the greatest freedom and activity of mind would shew no tendency to those ultra-rationalistic opinions which have found advocates among the ministers and laymen of the English Unitarian Church. The Committee seem to recommend that there should be positive Christian principles put forth, as those which it was the object of the organization to maintain and extend; but various communications have appeared in the *New York Inquirer*, arguing against any distinctive theology, and in favour of making the only basis, freedom of thought. Our experience of liberty-worshippers in these kingdoms has prepared us to find men on the other side of the Atlantic advocating the same impracticable principle. Free inquiry is a sacred duty, and far would it be from us to discourage it; but it is not everything, and it does not meet the wants of the soul in its temptations and its trials; and if, in the exercise of free inquiry, our Unitarian brethren in America have reached to a knowledge of the one God the Father, and the one Lord Jesus Christ, we trust they will not, for sake of peace, or through fear of being stigmatized as bigots, sink their great Christian principles. One writer on this subject in the *New York Inquirer*, pleading for unlimited license of thought, and for union on the simple ground of free inquiry, objects to a belief in God as the Maker of heaven and earth, in the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins and of the resurrection of the dead, alleging that God is too great to be represented as a *Maker* or *Architect*, that there is no such thing as the forgiveness of *sins*, but only of the *sinner*, and that any one who believes in a life everlasting cannot believe in a *resurrection from the dead!* While principles which we have never hesitated to represent as thoroughly Deistical—and some of them are more than Deistical—have largely impregnated the Unitarian denomination in America and in Great Britain, there is reason to apprehend that, at the approaching convention, the distinctive views of Christian Unitarianism may be thrown into the back ground; but we trust that it may be otherwise, and that

the great opportunity which in God's providence is afforded, may be wisely employed to spread not a system of human dogmas irrational and self-contradictory, and not a system of moral philosophy, however ingenious and beautiful, but "*the truth as it is in Jesus.*"

We subjoin the principal portions of an address, issued by a Sub-Committee, on the urgent importance of the approaching convention.

"NEW YORK, *Feb.* 10, 1865.

"DEAR BRETHREN,—You have recently received a call, inviting you to represent your Church and Society, by its pastor and two male delegates, in the General Convention of our Unitarian Body, to be held in the city of New York, on April 5, 1865. The General Committee created by the American Unitarian Association to issue that call appointed us a Sub-Committee to prepare an Address to the Churches on the urgent importance of the occasion.

"The great agitation through which our country has been passing during the last four years has shaken down many sectarian lines and prejudices; brought into view and acquaintance with each other those long separated and unknown; tested the worth of opinions, and shown what was practically inspiring and efficient in the beliefs of Christians; thrown open many doors of mental imprisonment, and enlarged the whole area of our moral and intellectual life as a nation. We have seen social and political prejudices of the most fixed and hopeless character, giving way before the majestic power of God's providence, and disappearing like a mist. Such vast changes in our political, economical, social, and intellectual life must inevitably be accompanied by great changes in the religious life and theological opinions of the American people. It is impossible that an adjustment should not take place between their altered views on all other subjects, and their old views on the subject of the Christian faith, and it is almost inevitable that a revolution in the theological life of the nation, as great as that taking place in its civil and political life, should follow upon it.

"Now, we have always been claiming, as Unitarians, that our theological opinions, besides being the simplicity of the Gospel, represented the spirit and wants of the nineteenth century, and that nothing but the cramping power of ecclesiastical authority, or prescriptive creeds, with the mighty force of old customs and old expressions, kept down the popular utterance of a Christian faith, essentially like our own. So effectually, however, have these or other influences, suppressed our growth as an organized body, represented by visible churches, that we barely maintain our place, and have been making, for many years, almost no progress in the country at large. We had to bear the stigma of having reared in our bosom the moral radicalism which produced the war. We were feared and systematically discouraged, and warned off the more productive fields of labour, and have been objects alike of political, social, and theological jealousy throughout the nation.

"But all this has now changed. What was so long our past shame is likely enough to become our future glory. That crust of ecclesiastical and theological usage, so long thickening with undisturbed possession of the surface, and which we could not puncture, has been broken up, as the ice is broken by the spring freshet. Men's minds and hearts are emancipated, at least for this noble hour, from the dominion of mere usage. There is a longing for light, a hospitality toward truth, a willingness to hear, and do, and accept new things, with a courage, faith, and aptitude for large and generous enterprises.

"Shall not the Unitarian denomination take advantage of this high-tide in the national life, to float itself over its old obstructions, out of its side-channel, into the main current of the religious feeling and Christian activity of the nation? Can that denomination much longer claim to have any right to live, much less any large prospects in the future, which, with the learning, wealth, moral purity, and spiritual illumination which we claim, is satisfied with a local and limited existence and influence, without popular acceptance, without missionary zeal, without growth, and without nationality? Surely we must arouse ourselves and claim our inheritance, assert our place and occupy it, or we shall fitly be left to dwindle and die of faithlessness and isolation.

"Want of zeal, and inaptitude for organization, the natural results of toleration and hatred of bondage, have long hindered us from forming into churches that immense body of people in the country, who, in silent indifference to the prevailing creeds, have forsaken all connection with the popular communions, and are now wholly unchurched and in danger of soon being wholly unchristianized. Without in the least trenching upon the great Christian denominations, is there not an immense floating body of intelligence, detached from all ecclesiastical relations, to which we owe the urgent and speedy presentation of our Christian views, and the shelter of our Christian communion? And is there not certain to be, the moment the thoughts of the country turn from the war, a still larger number of dissatisfied, inquiring, earnest, yet courageous and independent minds, to whom no existing organization of Christians offers the same welcome as ours, and whose wants can by no other be so well supplied? Moreover, are not all the popular sects agitated from within by the very questions which fifty years ago disturbed our hearts, and gave birth to our denomination? Is there not abundant evidence that if the actual state of theological opinion throughout our whole country now had existed in the early days of our movement, not merely Boston and its neighbourhood, but all America, would have gone over at one change, where the Unitarian churches then went? Why should they not do it now? And what a blessing for us, as well as for themselves, if the nation were enough *at one* in its faith, for Christians to withdraw their energies from controversy, and the tactics of jealousy and mutual counteraction, their eyes from dividing walls and distinctive opinions, and devote their united hearts and souls to the positive truth, the positive faith, and the positive work of the Gospel of Jesus Christ! We know not what fruits and flowers our liberal faith would produce, were it only nationalized, living in the genial climate of public

confidence, and with the common people lending their ardent affections, and bringing their great human instincts into its fold. Cold, fastidious, critical, not in itself, but wholly on account of the special class that chance to hold it, it is misunderstood, and has never taken its proper place in the world. Never, until adopted by the people, never, until commonly recognized as the Gospel itself, never, until reunited with the blessed traditionary impulses and associations which have always continued with the popular sects, will liberal Christianity show the world its real character, or, indeed, be known by its own professed disciples!

"It is not fitting to anticipate what the action of such a convention may be. It can of course do nothing to abridge the independence and freedom of our individual churches, nor to force upon any parties to it any common action which they do not heartily approve. Whatever it does, must and will be done with a tender regard to our congregational principles and our individual liberty. But it will doubtless strive to discover and set forth the possible grounds of a hearty agreement among ourselves, which abridges the freedom of none; of a stronger and more formal organization; of larger and more consentaneous activity in our missionary works, whether by means of denominational organs, by tracts, or by living messengers; and of the firm establishment of our interests at Antioch, and Meadville, and Cambridge.

"Begging your prayerful attention to the views in the address, we have, in concluding, only to implore the blessing of God upon your church and Society, upon our common cause as one branch of the Christian vine, and on the church universal!

"In the fellowship of the faith, and in the communion of the Lord Jesus Christ, your Christian brethren and servants,

"Henry W. Bellows,
Edward E. Hale,
A. P. Putnam,
} *Committee on Address.*"

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. III.—RALOO.

(*Concluded from p. 56.*)

On the "transportation" of Mr. Kelso from Raloo, in 1674, for want of maintenance, the existence of that Congregation as a separate religious community ceased, and it was not until 1838 that it was revived. During this long interval of 164 years, the people of the parish of Raloo, which is almost exclusively inhabited by Presbyterians, were connected with the adjoining Congregations of Broadisland (or Ballycarry) and Larne, from which they were about equally distant. But as in either

case the distance was nearly four Irish miles, and as the roads in those days were exceedingly bad, the attendance of the Raloo hearers upon public worship and other Christian ordinances was, in both Congregations, necessarily very irregular. To remedy this state of things, which was attended with many injurious results, especially to the younger members of families, it was determined, towards the end of 1837, by Messrs. Glendy and Classon Porter, the ministers respectively of Broadisland and Larne, to make an attempt to re-establish a Presbyterian Congregation in the parish of Raloo, to which resolution they were probably in some degree incited by a movement towards the same object which had been shortly before made by the adherents of the General Synod of Ulster in the same neighbourhood. The first meeting for the organization of a "new light" Congregation in Raloo was held in the Session-room of the Larne Congregation on Nov. 23, 1837, being a fast-day preparatory to Communion, on which occasion Mr. Glendy had preached. At this meeting it was resolved by those present, with the hearty concurrence and co-operation of their ministers, to proceed with the contemplated undertaking. An eligible piece of ground was offered by Mr. Samuel Drummond, of Drumahoe, free of rent, as a site for the proposed meeting-house. Collectors were appointed to canvass the parish for subscriptions, and subscription lists were handed them with the following heading:—

"We, the undersigned, living at a considerable distance from any Presbyterian house of worship, and being anxious to procure for ourselves and families the benefits of a Gospel ministry, do engage to contribute the sums annexed to our names for the purpose of erecting in the village of Raloo a meeting-house in which the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice shall be maintained; the right of every man to derive his own religious opinions from the written Word of God shall be upheld, and we and our descendants shall be enabled to worship our Maker according to the dictates of our consciences, none daring to make us afraid."

At this meeting arrangements were also made for having divine service celebrated, at various stations throughout the parish, during the ensuing three months, the officiating ministers being Messrs. Glendy, Classon Porter, James M'Dowell (Cairncastle), and John Gray, Student

of Divinity. In the meantime, the canvass for subscriptions towards the erection of the meeting-house was attended with great success, the list of subscribers containing, amongst other names, the following:—Rev. W. Glendy, £10; Rev. Classon Porter, £10; A. Barklie, £10; George Whitla, £7; Rev. D. Whyte (Ballee), £5; Rev. Dr. Drummond, £2; Rev. Dr. Ledlie, £2. Thus encouraged, the promoters of the undertaking set about the actual execution of the work with heart and good will. On Tuesday, January 2, 1838, the foundations of the new meeting-house were cut out on the ground offered as above, immediately adjoining the village of Raloo. On this occasion the first sod at each of the four corners was turned by Messrs. Glendy, Classon Porter, James M'Dowell, and John Gray. An appropriate address was also delivered to the assembled multitude by Rev. W. Glendy (Ballycarry), and a prayer for the divine blessing on the undertaking was offered up by Rev. Classon Porter (Larne). (See *Bible Christian*, ix. 38.) On Tuesday, March 20, 1838, the foundation-stone of the new meeting-house was laid by John Owens, Esq, J.P., of Ballyvoy House, eldest son of James Owens, Esq., J.P., who was that year High Sheriff of Antrim. At this interesting ceremony, which, notwithstanding the extreme severity of the day, was attended by an immense concourse of spectators, Mr. Classon Porter, as one of the trustees of the meeting-house, handed to Mr. Owens a sealed vase, containing the Holy Bible and various documents, which having been duly deposited in a prepared cavity, Mr. Owens placed directly over it the first stone of the building, saying to the assembled multitude, "In the name of God I lay this stone, as the foundation of a building intended for His worship, which, I trust, will, under His providence, prove a blessing to you, and to your children's children." The people then adjourned to a more sheltered place for the celebration of a religious service suitable to the occasion, which was conducted by Rev. James M'Dowell, of Cairncastle, who gave out a hymn in which the whole Congregation reverently joined; Rev. James Malcolm, of Carrickfergus, who read an appropriate passage of Scripture; Rev. W. Glendy, who delivered an admirable address; Rev. J. Scott Porter, of

Belfast, who expressed the satisfaction with which he had witnessed the day's proceedings, as well as his best wishes for the success of the undertaking; and Rev. Classon Porter, who concluded the religious services with prayer. (See *Bible Christian*, ix. 98.) The work thus auspiciously begun was carried on to a prosperous conclusion. The meeting-house was completed in little more than five months from the day on which its foundation-stone was laid; and on the 2nd September, 1838, it was opened for divine service by Rev. Dr. Montgomery, of Dunmurry, who rivetted the attention of a large and enlightened auditory by a most eloquent and argumentative discourse which occupied very nearly three hours in delivery, and at the close of which a collection amounting to £80 was taken up to assist in defraying the expense of erection. The new meeting-house, which was universally declared to be neat and commodious, was crowded in every corner, and the hall and doors were thronged with people who were unable to obtain seats inside.* (See *Bible Christian*, ix. 327.)

It will be seen that the order of proceeding, adopted in 1837-8 towards the formation of a Presbyterian Congregation of Raloo, was directly the reverse of what had been adopted for the same purpose in 1673. At the earlier date, the minister was chosen before the meeting-house was built. At the later date, the first thing done was to furnish the Congregation with "a local habitation" as well as a name, and no steps were taken towards the appointment of a minister until there was a house for him to preach in. This, however, being now accomplished, and the house being finished and opened free of debt, the Congregation set about procuring a stated occupant for their pulpit. On the 10th July, 1838, they had presented by their Commissioners, Messrs. Samuel M'Dowell, Thomas Moore, Francis Mahon, Samuel Blair Stuart, and Daniel Blair, to the Non-Subscribing Association meeting in Belfast, a memorial dated Raloo, July 7, 1838, and signed by Ephraim Craig as Chairman. In this memorial, which is printed in the

*The "old light" meeting-house in the parish of Raloo was completed and opened for public worship shortly after the "new light" one, as above described.

Minutes of the Association, they had given an account of the origin and progress of their undertaking, and asked the assistance of "the Three Bodies" in any form, and to any extent which might be thought expedient. The solicited aid was cordially given. Their case was strongly recommended to the liberality of the public, as well as to the favourable notice of the Trustees of the fund for the Protection of the Rights of Conscience, and the Home Mission Society of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster was earnestly urged to supply them with preaching until they obtained the services of a stated minister. In this latter object the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick (under whose care the new Congregation, from motives of local convenience, and with the full consent of Mr. Classon Porter, of Larne, to whose ministry three-fourths of them belonged, had been placed) heartily co-operated; and after the lapse of no very lengthened period, a regular minister was ordained in and for the Remonstrant Congregation of Raloo, so that in the settlement of their minister, as in the erection of their meeting-house, our friends had the foreway, by a few months, of their "old light" neighbours. I should have mentioned, that in December, 1838, a Sunday School was established in connexion with the Raloo Congregation.

The following is a record intentionally and indeed necessarily brief—for the events have been neither numerous nor important—of the ministries of those persons who have officiated in the new Congregation of Raloo:—

I.—1839 to 1848. John Compton, a native of the neighbourhood of Antrim, and a Licentiate of the Presbytery of Antrim, was, on the 6th August, 1839, ordained by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the Congregation of Raloo, where he continued until his death, which was awfully sudden, on the 27th March, 1848. Mr. Compton had preached with more than his usual energy on the day immediately preceding his decease (viz., Sunday, March 26), and had retired to rest, apparently in his usual health. On the Monday morning he was found dead in his bed. His remains were interred within his own meeting-house ground. The spot was enclosed some years ago by a

neat metal railing, at the sole expense of a person who was not even a member of his Congregation, and who further erected an unpretending tombstone to Mr. Compton's memory, with the following inscription, where it will be seen that the precise day of his death is not quite correctly given. He certainly died on the 27th, and not on the 25th March:—

"Erected by William Blair, of Pullendoos, to the memory of the late Rev. John Compton, first minister of the Remonstrant Congregation, Raloo, who died 25th March, 1848, aged 35 years."

II.—1848 to 1852. William Orr Magowan, who had previously been minister of Greyabbey, in County Down, was, on the 27th June, 1848, installed by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the Congregation of Raloo, which charge he demitted on May 1, 1852.

III.—1852 to ——. Thomas Smyth, who had previously been Assistant Minister of Glenarm, was, on the 29th June, 1852, installed by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the Congregation of Raloo, where he still continues.

I have only to add, that the minister of Raloo enjoys a commodious though moderate-sized manse, which was erected by the Congregation on a glebe of five statute acres, for which he is indebted to the kind intervention of Rev. Dr. Montgomery with the lord of the soil, the late Lord Dungannon.

Classon Porter.

Larne, *March* 16, 1865.

A SEARCH FOR PEACE.

I have sought east, I have sought west,
In quest of what I cannot find,—
A heart at peace with its own thoughts—
A quiet and contented mind.
I have sought high, I have sought low;
Alike my search has been in vain:
The same lip mixed the smile and sigh,
The same hour mingled joy and pain.

At first I sought 'mid sceptred kings—
  Power was, so peace might be with them,—
But they cast a look of weariness
  Upon the care-lined diadem.
I asked the soldier, and he spoke
  Of a dear, quiet home afar,
And whispered of the vanity,
  The ruin, and the wrong of war.

I saw the merchant 'mid his wealth:
  Peace surely would with plenty be.
But no; his thoughts were far abroad
  With their frail ventures on the sea.
I heard a lute's soft music float
  In summer sweetness on the air;
But the poet's brow was worn and wan;
  Peace surely was not written there.

And then I numbered o'er the ills
  That wait upon this mortal scene.
No marvel peace was not with them;
  The marvel were if it had been.
First, childhood comes with all to learn—
  And even more than all—to bear
Restraint, reproof, and punishment,
  And pleasures seen, but not to share.

Youth, like the Scriptures' madman, next,
  Scatt'ring around the burning coal,
With hasty deeds and misused gifts
  That leave their ashes on the soul.
Then manhood, weary, wasted, worn,
  With hopes misused and feelings dead,
And worldly cautions, worldly wants,
  Coldness, and carelessness instead.

Then age, dark, silent, sullen, drear,—
  The breaking of a worn-out wave,—
Letting us know that life hath been
  But the rough passage to the grave.

THE CHRISTIAN MIRACLES.

The testimony of Nicodemus to the reality of our Lord's miracles, and to the consequent divinity of his mission, has long appeared to me as, under the circumstances, the most valuable that could have been offered, whilst for all the purposes we need it must be regarded as conclusive. We have here, in the words of the historian, "A man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews." This person, a member of the most bigoted and exclusive sect that ever existed, one also of the supreme council of the nation, of the far-famed and dreaded Sanhedrim, comes to Jesus by night, led by an impulse he could not resist, yet fearful of being seen by others—seen especially by any of those with whom he was in the habit of familiar intercourse. Nicodemus, it is quite evident, was not a willing convert. There is no trace of enthusiasm in his demeanour or his conversation. He rather displays a cavilling spirit, makes captious objections, and asks, we may well imagine with a smile of contempt, "How can these things be?" As a Pharisee, he would be inclined to magnify tradition above the written law, and to hold the multitude, of which number Jesus himself was, in scorn. As a ruler, the pride of rank, the intense feeling of caste, and of his high station, would cause an assumption of superiority to popular views and demonstrations. Men, situated as was Nicodemus, are ever slow to receive impressions from the people, ever disinclined to examine fully and fairly for themselves into the foundations of the belief of those below them. Gallio, Festus, Agrippa, are well-known examples of this reticency on the part of men of exalted rank. Nicodemus would also not be free from the influence of the low and earth-born notions of the Messianic kingdom that so universally prevailed among his countrymen. He, in common with all others, expected a conquering Messiah, one who would lead the armies of Israel forth to victory, who would cause the Roman eagle to stoop to the lion of Judah, and who would establish his throne on the ruins of all other monarchies. Yet where were the signs of the coming of this great King? The guileless Nathaniel asked if any good thing could come out of Nazareth, and Nico-

demus might consider himself for a long time justified in not inquiring into the claims of one who was known only as the carpenter's son, and all whose friends were in the humbler ranks of life,—of one who had never sat at the feet of a learned doctor, and was without wealth, or station, or influence,—of one who, so far from being countenanced by the Sanhedrim, was most bitterly opposed by that body. What, then,—under circumstances so outwardly unfavourable to the claims of Jesus,—what compelled this master of Israel to come to him, though under the cloud of night, and to address him so respectfully, and to desire to know more of the doctrine? We answer in one word —*the miracles*. These alone arrested the attention of the high-minded, though timid and yet truth-loving Pharisee, and his introductory exclamation places this beyond the shadow of a doubt,—"Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him."

Now, this declaration asserts a fact, and it draws an inference from that fact: the fact, that Jesus had worked, was still working, miracles; the inference, that these miracles proved our Lord's divine authority. They were real and they were notorious. Nicodemus, as we have seen, had no previous bias in favour of Jesus or his claims; all his prepossessions would have been against them. But he is struck with the works themselves; he believes for their sake. These works had not been done in a corner, but in open day, in the places of public resort, in the presence of assembled multitudes, in the sight of inveterate foes. There was, then, no mistake as to their character or their tendency. They aroused the popular mind, every mouth spoke of them, every ear was eager to catch the rumour, and many gave glory to God in that he had thus visited his people with a mighty salvation.

And the inference of Nicodemus is just that which a sensible, reflective, and devout mind would naturally draw from the facts under its observation. None could do such works unless by power from on high. It is a miracle alone, an outward visible sign to those around, that can prove a divine messenger. His doctrine may be true; his words may drop "soft as the dew from

heaven;" he may speak with an angel's tongue; but men cannot know whether his commission be from God or himself, till he give a sign, patent and unmistakeable, that he is sent by the Father. The sign, the miracle, must establish his claim; nothing else will satisfy; without it, however pure the doctrine, however excellent the morality, he has no authority over the faith and conscience; he gives no sanction for his message; he is to us no more than Pythagoras or Plato. Nor could the miracle be wrought unless God were with him. No being, save God, has an inherent power to work miracles. He can, as a matter of course, confer this power on whom he pleases, and the power thus conferred sets the seal to the mission, gives it validity, and makes the messenger divine.

To those who deny the possibility of a miracle the foregoing remarks are not intended to apply. Persons holding this opinion have a right, such as it is, to make it known, and by all lawful methods to defend and promulgate it. Only it may be observed, that they appear to limit divine power almost to the verge of denying its existence. But to others who dare not go to this length, who allow that Almighty God can, may, work miracles, yet who profess not to be able to discern their uses, and who think that the Christian scheme is encumbered with them, to such we must be permitted to say, that if miracles may be wrought, and if it be also true that they have been wrought, then it is something like presumption in us, ignorant and short-sighted as we are, to attempt to discredit the evidences, or to speak slightly of the miracles themselves. Shall we

> "Snatch from his hand the balance and the rod,
> Rejudge his justice, be the God of God?"

Is it for us to decide on what is fittest and best for the Father of our spirits to do for the good of his frail, erring offspring? Rather let us admire his wisdom and bless his love that he has been pleased thus, through the miracles, to shine on our hearts, and to reconcile us by Christ unto himself. Bishop Butler has well remarked, that we take great freedoms with the Deity in our speculations concerning him; and it must be acknowledged

that great freedoms have been taken with regard to the things that have hitherto been most surely believed among us, been most unhesitatingly and gratefully received by us. Deeply grieved are we to find that such are now made matters of very small account. To me the Christian Scriptures would be perfectly unintelligible were the miracles left out of the records, nor can I understand any Christianity that is built on their rejection. As well might we conceive of the human body formed of the muscles, the nerves, and the blood-vessels, but *minus* the bones. The miracles are the bones of the system. The bones do not make the entire man; the miracles do not make the whole of the Gospel; but they are integral parts, giving strength and symmetry to all the rest, indispensable to the stability of the body thus fitly framed together. We believe in the Lord Jesus, because signs and wonders were done by him, and in his name. We believe in him, because he died and was raised to life again, and because God has given him a name above every name, that he might be the pattern and pledge of our own immortality.

AN OLD UNITARIAN.

NARRATIVES FROM REAL LIFE.

JOSEPH S——.

JOSEPH S—— was a fine-looking, venerable old man,—liberal-hearted, zealous, and truly devoted to God,—"an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile." He had been for many years an attendant at a Calvinistic place of worship, but the confined and unscriptural views there held forth never suited his benevolent mind; and coming one day accidentally to our chapel, the truths he there heard so powerfully impressed his heart, that he shortly afterwards expressed a desire to unite with us, and was received into fellowship. Great was the esteem with which he was regarded by his fellow-members on account of the piety of his spirit, the cheerfulness of his temper, and his anxiety to do good. He was a constant attendant and

leader at the social meetings for devotion on Sunday mornings and Monday nights. As an illustration of his character, I may relate the following circumstance. Calling one day to see a poor man in great distress, who had been dreadfully burned at an iron foundry, while sitting by the bed in an inner room, I heard Joseph's voice. "Come here, my precious dears," said he, "I have bought you some nice little shoes." So first one was fitted, and then another, until the whole family was shod. And what a happy sight it was to see those children capering about for joy, and the cheerful old man rejoicing merrily on a stool in their midst—pleased that he had been able out of his scanty pittance (for he was very poor) to do this good by stealth! I happened to witness the scene through a latticed window, though Joseph thought it was unobserved. And when I afterwards mentioned it to him, and the pleasure it gave me to witness it,—"Oh dear," said he, "I heard the poor things were badly off, and wanted to help them, if I could; but say nothing about it, say nothing about it."

I may also mention another instance. During the time our Sunday-school room was being built, we had one of the collecting boxes placed in the vestry; but as few went there, it gained no contributions, and we talked of removing it. One day, however, when the sexton was dusting the box, he heard a sixpence rattle in it, and the next week he heard two; the third week more; and thus the sixpences, week after week increased. As no person was observed to enter the vestry, we were all for some time at a loss to find out the contributor. At length one Sunday morning after the people were gone away from the prayer meeting, the sexton observed Joseph apparently engaged for a long time in looking for his hat, but, in reality, watching for an opportunity to drop the usual sixpence into the box unseen; and placing his hand behind him, and walking quietly backwards he accomplished his purpose. From inquiries which I afterwards made I found the poor old man had actually denied himself several little necessaries of life to enable him to do this out of about three shillings a week which he earned by mending shoes. And this contribution he continued to the last week of his life:—after his death the box was opened,

and the little heap of sixpences bore testimony to his self denial and his love.

Poor Joseph was unfortunate in his wife,—a bigoted old Calvinist,—a wicked weed,—who, when she could get it, loved a drop, and did all she could to make her husband miserable. He seldom returned home from the chapel without being abused, and not unfrequently was the brush thrown at his head. She was a bitter persecutor, and a hater of "Whigs and Unitarians," whom she declared to be "all as one," regarding the one as "the ruin of the country," and the other as "the ruin of people's souls." On one occasion, she came into the chapel at a time when a meeting was being held of the church members, and marching down the aisle cried out aloud, "This is the house of destruction." For many years after Joseph had become a Unitarian, and indeed until his death, she would not eat with him at the same table; and the last time he came to a Church meeting (which was shortly before he died), she followed him down the street, wishing aloud that he might be brought home either with his legs broken or a corpse! And his grown-up sons, also bigoted Trinitarians, treated him little better. But Joseph bore it all very patiently, being, as he said, "a man of peace," and fearful lest, by resistance, he should in any way dishonour the Saviour's cause. "When reviled, he reviled not again, but committed himself to him who judgeth righteously." He bent his knees in prayer (and I have often seen and heard him), and entreated God to forgive them and turn their hearts.

At length the period arrived in which Joseph was to be removed by death. For some time before his departure, he seemed ripening for another world. His last illness was but of a few days' duration. When first seized with his disorder, he was convinced he should not recover. On my going to see him, he said to me, "The time is at hand for which I have long been wishing, and I hope I shall soon be relieved. My pains are very great, and dying work is hard, but death itself has no fears for me. I long to depart and be with Christ." Before leaving, I read and prayed with him, and he seemed much comforted. On my bidding him farewell for the night,

seeing I was much affected, he said, "Don't sorrow; you will come in the morning, and if you find me dead, rather rejoice than weep, for I shall be gone before you to endless glory." Calling the next day, and finding him still alive, and somewhat relieved, I had a long and satisfactory conversation with him as to the foundation of his faith and hope. "Some persons," said he, "say we do not believe in the Saviour; but oh! what should *I* do without a Saviour now? I bless God that I have been brought by faith to Jesus Christ, and that in this awful time I can see my interest clear in him. Had I not sought to love and serve God in the time of health, how miserable should I be now that I am come to a bed of sickness!—but I bless his holy name that it is otherwise, and that I have inward peace." As I parted from him to attend a meeting at the chapel, he said, "Farewell! God be with you, and bless you, and all my dear brothers and sisters! Give my love to them all; tell them my heart is with them, though we shall meet no more on earth, and ask them to remember in their prayers their poor dying brother Joseph. Tell them that all is right with me now when it is come to the last, that I am not afraid to die, and that I hope we will all meet again in heaven. O how I used to love those meetings for prayer, and how often have I found them good for my soul! But it is time for you to go. Good bye. You are going to the house of prayer, I am going to the house of praise; —you to God's house below, I to God's house above! And there, *there* (said he, pointing upwards) we shall meet and never part."

When I called the next day, I found him dying fast. He had been a remarkably strong, athletic man, and nature was painfully struggling and clinging to life. He was crying out for release. There were none of our friends present (being afraid of the bigoted old woman, to whose abusive conduct they were no strangers), but there were several persons of different religious sentiments in the room, who had been brought together by the report of the great consolation which poor Joseph experienced in his dying hours. His wife and sons were by his bedside, and wept; but the former, thinking that his asking for his dismissal savoured of impatience, she rather hastily checked

him, on which he said, "Oh, I would not for worlds be impatient; but my soul *so* longs to depart and be with Christ, that I cannot help crying out." On my coming up to his bedside, and finding him blind, and nearly gone, I said "My dear old friend and brother, dost thou know me? He replied with much energy, "Oh, yes, I know that voice:—death has taken away my sight!—my eye-strings are broken!—it is dark, and I am getting stiff and cold:—I cannot move my arm, but (speaking to his wife who was at his side) put—his hand—into mine." I held his hand for some time, and felt its affectionate pressure. With our hands clasped together, I knelt down, and as well as my feelings would allow me, I commended him to God. It was a solemn season,—a season never to be forgotten. Every breath was getting shorter, and the rattle in his throat came on; still we could hear him saying now and then, "Saviour!—Jesus!" Having to preach at B—— that evening, I was obliged to leave the room before he was gone. As I bid him "farewell" he tried to speak, and at length said with a loud voice,—"Farewell—the Lord bless you!—I hope—we shall—meet again—in glory!" This was nearly his last effort. His lips moved as if in prayer, and shortly afterwards he ceased to breathe.

Poor Joseph! Thou hast had thy desire, and thy Saviour has called thee to himself. Thou art gone to the land "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest!" Thy friend and pastor sorrows over thy loss, but he sorrows not as one without hope. Very pleasant to him is the remembrance of thy excellencies, and thy memory will ever be sacred to his heart. Thou art gone at best but a little while before, and in the midst of his duties, he is encouraged to persevere by the hope of meeting hereafter with thy holy and happy spirit!

Joseph's funeral sermon was preached from Phil. i. 23, —"Having a desire to depart and be with Christ." As he was a man generally known and esteemed in the town, having resided there many years, a large congregation assembled on the occasion, many of whom showed by their tears the respect in which his memory was held.

LOYALTY TO CHRIST.

They who disbelieve in a special supernatural revelation, of which the New Testament contains the authentic record, assume two positions, in their judgment impregnable. They first appeal to a higher authority than external revelation; an authority within the soul, before which external instruction, of whatever character, and under whatever circumstances communicated, must be brought for an endorsement which shall give it validity. Nearly all the objections to an unimpeachable Gospel, with which we have of late been made familiar, turn on the reality of an intuitive perception of truth, to which outward testimony must be subordinated. This is the issue between philosophy and faith, or between consciousness and the Bible; and at first it may seem that consciousness has the advantage, because it is the witness which the soul cannot but accept as decisive over any other. But human consciousness is not infallible, for it often misunderstands itself; and it becomes a question of fact, whether man has an intuitive recognition of the higher religious truths—a fact which can be established only by observing the aggregate consciousness of the race, or by analyzing the operations of the individual soul. Collectively, the human race has shown an inaptitude to discover or retain the great religious truths; and Paul was right when he said not only that "the world by wisdom knew not God," but that "the foolish heart" of mankind "was darkened." The Gospel was needed for the great multitude, included under the title of "the poor" by him who came to be "the light of the world." History lends but little support to the intuitive philosophy. Still less encouragement, if possible, does a study of individual experience furnish; for but few men interpret their consciousness as the theory requires. Few men perceive the handwriting of God on the walls of their own spiritual being, or evolve eternal truth from their own mental conceptions. In fact, the language with which many persons are captivated is deceptive. The three fundamental ideas of which, it is said, the soul is conscious, are God, the moral law, and immortality. Yet the soul can only be conscious of its own exercises and of its present state. Its faith in God, or in immortality, or

even in duty can be nothing more than an inference from certain facts of which it is cognizant, and which it brings together in such a manner as to deduce from them a result with which it is satisfied ; so that its knowledge or persuasion of the highest truths is secured through a process of reasoning, not through the affirmation of an intuitive faculty. Man needs an external voice to rectify and sustain, if not to implant his religious convictions.

The other position taken by those from whom we are compelled to differ, is meant to cover in a measure that which we have just examined. If the soul cannot rely on its intuitions, there is nothing, we are told, on which its faith can rest. Not on a revelation made in a past age and transmitted through the uncertain channel of historical records ; nor on a book, the genuineness of which is open to disastrous criticism, and the interpretation of which is as various as the theologies which wrangle over its pages. We want, it is said, something more trustworthy. If, however, we cannot have anything more worthy of confidence, for dear humanity's sake let us accept this ; for this book is not a fallacious guide. Its essential contents are plain enough, and its faithfulness of representation can be established by ample proof. "Bibliolatry!" may be the derisive cry ; but if a book supply the best evidence of God's love which we can have, why be afraid of trusting a book ? An immediate and continual revelation, not one receding to a greater and greater distance, is the demand ; but if a light shining from the past, with a brilliancy that does not fade with distance, send forth a safer illumination than any nearer object, why not walk in its brightness ? Men do not prefer the gas-lamp at the corner of the street to the sun in the distant heavens. To some eyes it seems an unsteady light, which throws its rays from the past ; and no one, again, it is said, can prove that it was kindled by the Divine hand. Not, indeed, as we establish the propositions of Euclid. Religion is not one of the exact sciences. Moral and spiritual truths do not fall within the province of demonstration. Faith is neither led blindfold through the mysteries of Divine grace ; nor is she, on the other hand, gifted with such a power of vision that she can see through all the forms and mutations of being to the eternal

and unchangeable order whence they proceed. What, then, is her privilege, or her office? To use gratefully and intelligently the means of ascertaining truth, which are put within her reach; to believe on the best evidence of which the case admits. If it be more reasonable to accept the New Testament than to discredit its instruction—if the only explanation that can be given of the New Testament be the explanation it gives of itself—if Christ's own testimony be more credible than any correction of that testimony—if a special revelation not only was the great want of mankind, but has met and relieved its necessities—if miracle be in the moral economy of the universe a normal method, though in its historical occurrence it be supernatural—then faith has sufficient justification of its act in believing, although it build on one foundation and science build on another. The dwellings of Amsterdam are better habitations than caverns cut in solid rock, even if they seem less secure; they are safe enough for all the uses of life.

Do we place faith, then, in vassalage to the reason? By no means. We take the faculties and privileges of our being as the Creator has bestowed them, neither ascribing to man what he does not possess, nor depreciating what is intrusted to him. We take life on the conditions on which it is given, and are willing and glad to be religious on God's own terms. We hold that the early school of Unitarianism in this country was right in assigning to reason the twofold office of investigating, and on satisfactory evidence certifying, the claims of the Bible, and of rendering its language into modern thought according to sound rules of interpretation; and we hold that when reason has performed this good service for faith, faith, provided with the sceptre which reason has put into her hands, assumes the control alike of the speculative and the active powers of our being, and leads them reverently to the feet of him in whose behalf she abdicates every right but that of guarding the soul's loyalty to him, its Divinely-appointed Ruler.

This loyalty is a frank and consistent assertion of faith in Christ as the supernaturally qualified Teacher, Redeemer, and Lord. If it be frank, it will embrace every suitable opportunity of confessing Christ before men; if it be

consistent, it will avoid those ambiguous phrases which betray the cause into whose service they are taken. There is always danger that the obligation of courtesy, the feeling of good-will, a dislike to giving offence, or a dread of the sarcasm which confounds reverential conviction with subserviency to the general belief, will be a temptation to compromise our allegiance to the truth. Unitarianism has suffered enough on one side from this temptation; let it not now suffer on the opposite side. It is remarkable with what emphasis Christ calls his disciples to "confess" him, to bear his name as well as his cross, to speak on his behalf, to remember him. Indeed, the frequency with which he brings his personal relation to them into view is one of the peculiarities of his discourse. There is an intrusion of his personality that would strike us as offensive egotism, if it were not sustained by the Divine element, which, as we have seen, entered into his consciousness. Instead of forgetting himself, or wishing to be forgotten, in loyal attachment to the truth, he represents the truth as passing into concrete and palpable form in himself: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." We can reconcile this desire of Jesus to keep himself before the eyes of his disciples with the humility of which he makes himself an example, only by recalling his consciousness of a superiority that arose out of his place in the Divine arrangements for human salvation. "If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet," is his language. It seems to me very plain, that he meant to bind the soul to himself in a fealty which should never be lost amidst the vagaries of a transcendental faith. Higher than Christ I cannot go, except through him and with him to the Father; lower than Christ I will not stay, for then I should prefer the damp fog to the clear hill-top. Without Christ I cannot live, unless I am ready to give up the strongest, I might almost say the only incontrovertible proof I have that God is good; together with that revelation of his character, from which they who speak slightingly of the messenger through whom it was made, deduce the argument by which they attempt to vindicate their independence of his authority. I cannot leave the name of Christ out of sermon and prayer, lest I should show a want of filial confidence in God; for it is through Christ

that I have learned to call him Father, and I shall not prize the benefaction less for remembering by whom it was conveyed to me. I am not content to adopt the words of an English preacher, and say that "Jesus, though neither Messiah nor Logos, is still the glory of Judaism, the temple of God, and the foremost soul in history;" for, while this language may have been used in honest admiration, it drags him, in whom the prophecies of the Messiah were fulfilled, and in whom the Word was made flesh, from his seat at the Father's right hand, to take the first rank in a procession of self-illuminated spirits pursuing their devious way through the mysteries of existence—and I want a surer guide. I am bound by my faith in Christ to be offended, when I am invited to read an exposure of his errors, or a piece of smart literary criticism on his character. Rather than be silent under such injustice to him who is the world's light and life, I would borrow the watchword which an unsound Christology has wished to appropriate to its own uses, and call on my brethren to "stand up for Jesus." And when I speak of myself in such a connection, I mean to say that this is what I believe every Christian minister and every Christian man should do.—*Rev. Dr. Gannett.*

FREE PRAYER *VERSUS* FORMS OF PRAYER.

On reading the notices, which appeared in your last two numbers, of Dr. Lee's Book on the Reform of the Church of Scotland in the matter of public worship, I was much struck by the remarks which were quoted from that author on the subject of "free prayer," and think that they apply to Irish as well as to Scotch Presbyterians. With us, as well as with our Scottish brethren, I apprehend that ministers in too many cases pay very little attention, and indeed apparently attach very little importance, to the devotional part of the service, or the "preleeminaries," as the Scotch sexton called them. This portion of their pulpit performances they generally scramble over with indecent haste, in order that they may get to the sermon, on which their entire pains have been expended; and to which they know that the attention of their hearers

is mainly directed. The consequence is, that with them what is called "free prayer" becomes, of all kinds of prayer, the most restricted and monotonous. Their thoughts and expressions soon make for themselves a groove, in which exclusively they run, so that in a short time these ministers come to have in reality but one prayer, which is known and recognized as theirs wherever they go. And then, who amongst us has the gift of prayer? Not one in one hundred. I have heard from Presbyterian pulpits prayers of every length and of every kind. I have heard short prayers, consisting of two or three verses from the Book of Proverbs, which the minister recited with his eyes shut, or fixed on the ceiling, and then sat down, evidently thinking that he had spent time and breath enough upon the "preleeminaries." I have heard long prayers made up of interminable sentences which the minister laboriously constructed as he went along; which it took him an hour or more to compose and deliver; and the time spent in the enunciation of which so effectually tired the limbs and backs of his hearers, that when they *were* allowed to sit down, their feeling of satisfaction—visibly and almost audibly expressed—prevented them, for several minutes, from paying the slightest attention to the succeeding part of the service. I have heard, too, from Presbyterian pulpits, prayers of almost every kind. I have heard logical and metaphysical prayers, which were mainly taken up with proving to God that there was a God. I have heard anatomical prayers, reminding the Almighty, in complimentary terms, of the judicious manner in which He had compacted us with bones and sinews. I have heard pictorial or poetical prayers, opening with a masterly sketch of a splendid sunrise; followed up by a full-sized picture of a glorious summer's day, and concluding with a word-painting of a gorgeous sunset, which, as it left the firmament in a blaze of light, so it left the hearers, or beholders, to gaze, if they could, "through golden vistas up to heaven." I have heard also historical prayers, recalling to the recollection of the King and Ruler of the world some of the most remarkable incidents connected with His past doings towards His children of mankind. Nay, on one occasion—but it was only one—I heard a geographical prayer, in which the physical

features and conformation of the Holy Land were, at the footstool of divine grace, minutely if not edifyingly described. All these kinds of prayer have I heard from a Presbyterian pulpit, but very seldom have I heard therefrom what could be properly called a devotional prayer. And in this respect the prayer after sermon is commonly the worst. In most cases, it is only the sermon prayed in the same order in which it has just been preached; so that any one who remembers the divisions of the discourse can easily anticipate the heads of the prayer.

But my great objection to "free prayer" is, that in no proper sense of the words can it be called the prayer of the people. It is the prayer of the minister, and of the minister alone. All that the people have to do with it is to listen to it if they like, and to follow it if they can. Now, the latter of these two operations is more difficult than is commonly supposed. If the people can contrive to keep their attention fixed to what is said during the time of prayer, they may know, at any one period, what their minister is actually saying, but they cannot tell what he is going to say. The pray—er, therefore, they may possibly follow; but in the prayer they cannot possibly join. Hence the peculiarly irreverent appearance which is too often presented by a Presbyterian Congregation whilst professedly engaged in prayer. But for this apparent irreverence on their part great allowance should be made. They really are very awkwardly situated. They are supposed to be co-operating in a religious service, in which, however, except by a figure of speech, they cannot be said to take a part; and therefore, as it is a general rule with human beings when they are placed in such embarrassing positions, or when they do not know what to do, either to cough or clear their throats, we need not be surprised that both these operations are occasionally performed by the hearers of "free prayer," even when they are presumed to be standing face to face with their Maker.

And then how unconcernedly will our people come into their house of worship during the time of prayer, and open and shut their pew doors, as if nothing of any particular importance to any one except the minister, were going on. Nay, how little discomposed are they if

they are late for the prayer altogether, and think they have not had their journey for nothing if they are in time for the sermon. But on these points I forbear to dwell. Let me only say, in conclusion, that I think it becomes all Presbyterian ministers, but especially all Liberal Presbyterian ministers, to take the warning given to them on this point by the Duke of Argyle, Dr. Lee, and many others, and to reform their method of public worship without delay, if they would not see the flower of their flocks continuing to desert a service which their taste and judgment condemn, and find themselves left with the mere dregs of their congregations.

A. B.

MR. JOSEPH BARKER AND THE UNITARIAN DENOMINATION.

Some time ago we expressed our gratification at learning that Mr. Joseph Barker, who was at first a preacher among the New Connexion Methodists, subsequently embraced Christian Unitarian views, and afterwards passed over to Secularism and utter unbelief, had returned to the Christian faith, and had borne testimony in his *Review* against the chilling and ruinous influences of infidelity. What form of Christianity Mr. Barker had embraced we had no means of accurately knowing, but for him to accept Revealed Religion in any form was enough to afford subject of congratulation. We have since understood that Mr. Barker was disposed to throw himself again into the Unitarian ranks, and give his confessedly great powers of argument to the support of a cause which, in former years, he had greatly helped, and to which, partly by his lectures, and partly through the agency of his tracts, he had added many adherents in the North of England, who, still holding firmly those rational and Scriptural principles, gratefully attribute to Mr. Barker's labours the light which they had received. The weathercock character, however, which his repeated changes of opinion had earned for him, rendered many Unitarians distrustful of him, and he met with little encouragement from the denomination, especially as he manifested leanings towards the Methodist connexion, from which he had at first separated. Recently, we understand, he has completely identified himself with this body of Christians, and of the course he has taken in doing so we have no ground to complain: but those who knew him best, and who most admired the great abilities with which he was gifted, have often had reason to regret the strong and violent language with which he was accustomed to denounce all who happened to be his opponents. What has moved his ire against the Unitarian body we are at a loss to conceive, but we are sorry, for his own sake, to find in *The In-*

quirer of the 4th March, a notice of a lecture which he lately gave in Devonport, in which the following sentences occur :—

"The Unitarian ministers he [Mr. Barker] described as intemperate in their habits, low in their morals, while the leading members of their congregations were no better. Their ministers, he declared, fraternised with Holyoake and "Iconoclast," and their proper place was among the infidels. They were very friendly with him when he was an unbeliever, but since his return to Christianity he had received from the Unitarians nothing but low abuse."

That a few, nominally connected with the Unitarian denomination, but really deistical or atheistical in their opinions, may have encouraged Mr. Barker in his efforts to disseminate infidel views we can readily believe, for an extreme sensitiveness about interfering with religious freedom has sometimes led to a toleration of sentiments that were directly opposed to Divine revelation, and we have not been slow to express strong dissent from such latitudinarian views; but the fact that from the time when Mr. Barker joined the Secularists, and opposed Revealed Religion, he never occupied a Unitarian pulpit, and never was recognized as having any connexion with the denomination, is a sufficient reply to the false accusation he has made against them of abetting his efforts to spread unbelief. The charge of intemperance and immorality is so notoriously untrue that we may pass it over in silence. Without arrogating to our denomination any pre-eminence in morals over our Christian brethren of other churches, we may be excused for stating that those who dissent most strongly from our theology often speak most favourably of our morality; and a popular preacher of the English church alleged some years ago, as an explanation of the high moral character of Unitarians, that the Devil was sure of having them at last, and therefore did not try them with the strong temptations with which he beset the true believers!

But perhaps the best reply to the false and abusive tirade in which Mr. Barker has indulged against our church is to remind him of the similarly foul and virulent terms in which he years ago assailed all Trinitarians, including the Methodist New Connexion, and of the flattering language in which he characterised Unitarians. Out of many passages which we might quote, we shall be satisfied with giving the following brief extract :—

"With what is the Trinity connected in the Orthodox sects of Britain and North America? With intolerance, divisions, and persecutions,—with man-stealing, and slave-breeding, and slave-dealing; with covetousness, oppression, and drunkenness; with lying and slandering; with forging lies and hypocrisy; with robbery and murder; . . . . with wholesale and horrible profligacy, and with all abominations. And the priests, the advocates of those mysteries, are the worst, the most profligate, the most filthy, and the most abandoned of all. . . . The Arians of Ireland, so far as I am acquainted with them, are among the most kind-hearted and generous, the most pure and lovely, the most beneficent and Christ-like of the human race. The Unitarians of England are amongst the best specimens of sanctified humanity with which I have become acquainted here. . . . They are a people truly worthy of the Christian name; and Christianity may well receive honour from the character of many of them."

We have taken these passages from his "Discussion with William Cooke," pp. 229, 301, omitting some expressions with which we could not defile our pages, and omitting, also, the italics and capitals which he has employed to give increased virulence to his abuse. In all ranks and grades of society—lecturers on religion not excepted—there are a few whose "tongue is no scandal;" that Joseph Barker belongs to that unhappy class few will deny; and perhaps the best way to treat the foul and outrageously false attacks which he makes on others is to pay no heed to them.

ADELAIDE UNITARIAN CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

BELFAST, 24*th March*, 1865.

DEAR SIR,—May I request space in your pages for the following letter, which I have received this day from my valued friend and fellow-labourer, the Rev. J. C. Woods of Adelaide, South Australia:—

"ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, *Jan.* 27*th*, 1865.

"MY DEAR SIR,—My congregation has increased so much lately that the members have raised a sufficient sum of money for enlarging the church, and, at my suggestion, they are going to build a new vestry, a school-room, and a room for a library. I have promised to help them in starting a library, and I ask your assistance. I think it probable that you and your friends at Belfast may have duplicate copies of a great many works on liberal theology, and of serious literature, which would be very useful to us in these remote regions, and which you may be willing to give us. Any parcel or box of books sent to Messrs. Martineau and Smith, Birmingham, would be forwarded to me in Adelaide. I have not written to any other Irish friend on this subject, so I leave it entirely with you. You will be pleased to hear that I and my family are well, and that our cause here is very flourishing. With kind regards, I am, ever truly yours,

"J. C. WOODS.

"Rev. J. S. Porter."

It is my intention to make up a parcel of such books as I can spare, which seem suitable for the purpose contemplated by Mr. Woods and his flock, and to forward it as soon as possible through the channel indicated; and as I esteem the object well worthy of support, I invite the co-operation of any friends who may be able to assist. I intend to keep my parcel open till the 1st of May, before which time friends who mean to lend their aid will be kind enough to forward their contributions. Of course, however, those who have ready means of communicating with Birmingham will please to send their contributions to Messrs. Martineau and Smith directly.—I remain, Dear Sir, most respectfully yours,

J. SCOTT PORTER.

INTELLIGENCE.

LONDON DISTRICT UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The fifty-first social meeting of this society was held on Friday evening, February 24th, at Radley's Hotel, Blackfriars, when a large number of members and their friends were present.

The Rev. R. B. Aspland, on taking the chair, said he was glad to give public expression to the increasing value he assigned to the system of doctrines generally known as Unitarianism. The more he studied the Bible the stronger was his conviction that Unitarianism is the doctrine of the Bible. His feeling was that of growing satisfaction with the Scriptural evidence of our faith. It is one of the chief characteristics of Unitarianism that it combines in equal proportions respect for religious truth and for individual freedom. There is not perfect, absolute freedom from all restraint in anyone who accepts religion as a revealed system of truth, because Revelation means the manifestation of truth from a higher authority and wisdom than our own. So in one respect we have not that absolute freedom which the Deist and Atheist claim, but we have all that amount of freedom which is compatible with a sincere adherence to divine truth. If Unitarians look with an equal eye both to truth and freedom, they will be in a direct road to attain religious truth and to preserve it. In some cases there had been a too exclusive regard to freedom, which had led to indifference to truth, but he believed that the ultimate result of freedom would be to guide to truth. The chairman then called upon Mr. Spears to open the subject appointed for discussion, which was, "The Present Aspect of Opinion in Relation to Unitarianism in Europe and America."

Mr. Spears opened his subject by saying, the careful observer of the history of religious opinions cannot fail to recognise the fact that there is an atmosphere of thought at times more or less favourable to religious reforms. There are aspects and tendencies in the present day which augur some great change among the churches. For many ages the tide of error and superstition set in strongly upon the Christian church; every historian testifies to this; there is now an ebb in that tide, and the receding waters of superstition and unfounded dogma will ultimately leave bare the rock of the ancient Christain truth, and then a new career of usefulness and a better mission and history will mark the career of the Christian religion. In dealing with the subject, he must be allowed to overlook the Unitarian name and consider solely religious principles. At the present day Trinitarians concede they find powerful influences opposed to the diffusion of their particular doctrines at home and abroad. He was much surprised the other day to find an article in the *Church and State Review* recommending a kind of compromise with the Mahometans. It was a leader which clearly stated that they could not succeed with those people without softening down their differences. This is one of those journals that have condemned Colenso for allowing a Zulu to affect his orthodoxy.

There cannot be a doubt that the views of 800,000,000 of people must ultimately have an appreciable influence on the Trinitarian church. Christian Missionaries in their own reports show how they are staggered by the theological position and arguments of men, at home called heathen. What a stumbling-block and humiliation is the doctrine of the Trinity, that the supposed heathen hurl back upon us the charge of idolatry. The same obstacles are found in China. One statement from the Rev. Griffith John, a returned Trinitarian missionary, must suffice. Describing a chief leader of the Taeping rebellion, he says, "He is a model of moral propriety and of great literary ability. Of the doctrine of the Trinity he has not the slightest conception. The heavenly Father is God alone to him, and Christ a distinct being. Probably the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity has never been presented to his mind in a way that he could understand it. He is a thinking man, and won't take the *ipse dixit* of any one for proof or demonstration." We all feel interested when some distinguished scholar finds in the East a manuscript containing some evidence of the historic truthfulness of our religion. Is it not a subject of transcendent interest when we find hundreds of millions in a living protest against any error, and rebuking a false theology? Our increase of commerce with those nations, the facilities of travel and commingling together of East and West, our appliances which lessen geographical distance, will prove an advantage to both. The firm and intelligent front which those nations present to Trinitarianism must ultimately modify it and aid the cause of pure Christianity. When we survey the condition of the continent of Europe we see what both dispirits and cheers us. For nearly three hundred years there have been Unitarian churches in Transylvania. At present they number upwards of one hundred ministers and 150 churches, and are an educational and religious power in their country. Kossuth bore testimony to their patriotism and virtue. In Switzerland we are told there is a wide-spread liberal sentiment. A writer in one of the orthodox papers recently said, "Go through the twenty-two cantons of Switzerland, beginning at the home, the church, the grave, the pulpit of Calvin, to whose memory they carve not a line, they raise not a stone, and you will find the old church of Switzerland openly Socinian." The most hopeful signs on the continent are found in Germany and Holland. The movement of the German Catholic or Free Church of Ronge has not proved very successful. It numbers between forty and fifty thousand adherents. The orthodoxy of Germany and Holland is shaken. The evidence of this is endless—that the churches called Calvinistic and orthodox are only so in name. A Dutch and Trinitarian clergyman was lecturing in the north of England lately, and said that of the 1,500 Protestant ministers in Holland, 1,400 were essentially Unitarians. A letter in the *Nonconformist* from another clergyman said that the church establishment of Holland might be called a Rationalistic Unitarian Establishment. The Protestant population of Prussia and Germany numbers about twenty millions, and among these the Unitarian faith has a deep root. We need not feel surprised at this when we know that the writings of Zschokke, the author of the Queen's Book, is a family book in Germany. For many years the

doctrine of endless misery has had little hold of the German mind. The late Dr. Bunsen said that the influence of Dr. Channing's works was greater in France and Germany than of any other man, living or dead. We have had our attention called to France of late as presenting much more favourable aspects for the success of our views. The correspondent of the *News of the Churches* gives a hopeless view of the hold of the Roman Catholic faith on the mass of thinking men there. The correspondents of more than one of our London papers believe that the Protestant consistory will not be able to hold its ground against the Liberals, or the Unitarian party, as one paper calls them. Few as our friends are in France, they are men of marked ability, energy, and eloquence, and have put some of our Unitarian tracts into French. Little as he could say for France as yet, still less for Italy. Some little spring flowers appear in the kingdom of Italy now from liberty of worship, printing and reading the Bible. He had heard Gavazzi say that the Protestantism of England won't do for Italy; they must have the Christianity of the New Testament there. We turn attention to Scandinavia, and we find that there are indications of change even there. In a periodical conducted by the High-church party of Sweden it is stated that a great and important crisis is before their church. Dr. Pusey expressed himself at Oxford some time ago as apprehensive of the orthodoxy of the church of the Princess, and caused some little alteration to be made in the address. The progress of Unitarian sentiment in America is very rapid. A wide-spread and healthy influence has been exercised by the writings of Dr. Channing. Other writers and divines of our church have made our views widely and deeply felt. We are told that forty years ago Dr. Beecher went to Boston to extinguish Unitarianism, and at the present time it flourishes, and the whole Beecher family, so influential, are regarded as given over to heresy; they are spoken of as renouncers of some of the cardinal doctrines of Presbyterianism. There are many causes—educational, social, and political, as well as religious—that conduce to the spread of Unitarianism there. They have no state church, and that is a decided advantage to them. The political status of all citizens of any profession of religion is unimpaired. It is true that the numerical strength of the Unitarian denomination in America is not very imposing. There are about 320 ministers and 256 churches, with about 20,000 communicants and a population of 300,000. But as Sir Charles Lyell says, "The prominent position of the Unitarians in America arises, not from their number, nor their wealth, however considerable this may be, but from their talent, earnestness, and knowledge." In America there are other three denominations of considerable numerical strength and influence which are openly Unitarian in their theology. The Friends, says Eadie, number about 500 congregations, with a population of about 100,000. About two-thirds of these are heterodox. There is a larger and increasing church called simply "Christians;" the *Congregational Journal* stated some time ago that the denomination known as Christians embraced about 1,200 ministers, 1,500 churches with about 300,000 members. They sustain six weekly newspapers, and four respectable seminaries of learning. Then there is the

Universalist Church. He took the following statistics from one of their papers a few years ago: They had nineteen state conventions; four educational, nine missionary, and four Sunday School societies; relief fund of 14,000 dollars for infirm clergymen and widows; 1,334 churches or societies; 913 meeting-houses; 656 preachers; eighteen periodicals; nine institutes of learning; and a population of about 500,000 people. One of their papers some time ago stated all their churches were Unitarian. There is a class of people in the United States called Spiritualists. In the course of fifteen years they have attained immense power, and number nearly 2,000,000 adherents. History affords no parallel to their success. In general they reject the Trinitarian dogmas, they emphatically repudiate the ordinarily taught terms of salvation, and deny the doctrine of hopeless reprobation. All the future to them is beautiful and progressive. They have a large number of journals and most able writers in America. They are quite an army of protesters against the old theology; they stand nearly identified with our views of God, duty, and eternity. In the last place, he would review the position of Unitarian sentiment at home. This ought to be of foremost importance to us. We regret our numerical strength is not great. As a denomination we possess less than 300 churches, with a population of nearly 100,000 adults and children. We need not be surprised at so few identifying themselves with us when we know that many among us would like to rid themselves entirely of the name Unitarian. Macaulay very truly said "A dominant church ranks among its numbers multitudes who have no religion at all; on the other hand, every member of an oppressed church is a man who has a very decided preference for that church: the effective strength of sects is not ascertained by counting heads." This is a transparent truth in the present day. The Church of England numbers in its fold one-half of the people, ten millions; how few of these would suffer for her sake? Theologically she is in a transition state. About eight thousand of her ministers refused to sign the orthodox declaration from Oxford. The Colenso excitement and the popularity of "Essays and Reviews" are ominous to orthodoxy in England. The popularity of Caird's Sermons he thought a good sign: the issue of Zschokke's works, "Meditations on Death and Eternity," by the Head of the Church, more favourable still. There are numerous causes, educational, philosophical, critical, historical, and humanitarian, that have forced attention to our views, and at present provoke and sustain opposition to the Trinitarian theology. Scholarly men like Dr. Bunsen have declared there are serious errors in the common theology. Scientific men like Humboldt have stood aloof and expressed their faith in a broader way and in better words than the Church. Historians of the Church like Moshiem, Neander, and Milman, have led the world up to the church of the first centuries, and shown that the theology of the present is as dissimilar from the apostolic church as the composite architecture of the degraded dark ages is from the simple arch of heaven. Dr. Brewster sees, in the scientific views of a plurality of worlds, the doom of the vicarious theory. Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," and Professor Owen's teaching on animal creation are opposed to the plenary inspiration of the Bible.

The influence of the best poems, novels, and the press in general of our country are all decidedly antagonistic to the professed orthodoxy. The practical effect of these things ought to be to us as the rain of spring, the warmth of summer, or the rich harvest of autumn. Then it is sin for the husbandman to fold his arms when all around gives sign of production and useful toil. On the vineyard of the Lord there is light, the air is full of congenial religious thought. If we now fold our arms in this season of the world's history, and refuse to do our share of work, we had better not have been born in this eventful age of golden opportunities.

Mr. J. Green, the Revs. M. C. Conway and H. Iverson, Mr. Alderman Lawrence, and others, spoke on the subject of Mr. Spears' paper. Mr. Spears briefly, in reply, noticed some objections, and corrected some misapprehensions, and a very interesting and animated discussion was then closed with prayer.

LIVERPOOL DOMESTIC MISSION.

On Monday evening, February 20th, the annual tea-meeting of the above Mission was held at the Mission House, Bedford Street, on which occasion the members had the pleasure of welcoming the Rev. John Shannon, their new minister. Two hundred persons were present. After tea the chair was occupied by the Rev. John Robberds. A hymn having been sung,

The CHAIRMAN briefly reviewed the experience of the preceding year, adverting to the losses by death and the prevalence of fever, notwithstanding the active and zealous efforts of the Health Committee of the Town Council. He then said that the special significance of the present meeting was to give a welcome to their newly-appointed minister; and, after dwelling upon the importance of the work to which he was about to devote himself, he called upon Mr. Bowring to offer a welcome to Mr. Shannon on the part of the Domestic Mission Society.

C. T. BOWRING, Esq., in the absence of Thomas Avison, Esq., President of the Mission, offered a hearty welcome to Mr. Shannon on behalf of the supporters, and gave his hearty sympathy to him, and his best wishes for success in his new sphere of labour.

The CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. Harrison to welcome Mr. Shannon in the name of the congregation.

Mr. HARRISON said that he hoped there was now a prospect of the congregation becoming settled, for they had had to part with no less than three ministers in about nine years—Mr. Bishop, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Steinthal. He thought he might confidently promise Mr. Shannon, on behalf of the congregation, all the sympathy, co operation, and support it was in their power to give him.

The Rev. J. SHANNON, in responding, said he was obliged for the kind way in which the words of welcome had been spoken by Mr. Bowring and Mr. Harrison, and the hearty manner in which they had been received. It had been hard for him to part from valued friends in Hull whom he had known for nineteen years, but the pain of separation was alleviated by the feeling that he would make new friends in the field of labour upon which he was entering, and that he would find warm and generous hearts who would sustain

and help him in the arduous duties that he had undertaken. He should address himself with all his strength to the special and peculiar work of the Mission—distracting himself as little as possible with extraneous engagements—and if he failed, it would at least be with the consciousness that he had done what he could. Again cordially thanking them for the hearty reception they had given him, Mr. Shannon concluded with expressing an earnest wish that their brightest hopes respecting the Mission might be abundantly realized.

The Rev. J. WILSON, as a former minister of the Mission, wished Mr. Shannon every success in his new undertaking, and said he must be prepared to encounter an amount of wretchedness, drunkenness, and poverty almost inconceivable. He hoped the supporters of the Mission would not only give their money, but what was far more valuable, their active support and sympathy.

Mr. JONES spoke of the value of the Temperance Society as an agency of the Mission. The greatest obstacle they had to contend with was intemperance, and the most effectual cure was teetotalism. There were many in that room whose hearts were full of gratitude for the good they had received at that Mission, and who had first been brought into connection with it by means of the Temperance Society.

Several other addresses were delivered, and the meeting closed by singing the dismissal hymn.

THE LATE ROBERT ANDREWS, ESQ., LL.D., Q.C.

At a special meeting of the Committee of the Association of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland, which was held in Belfast on Tuesday the 28th February, 1865, and which was numerously attended,—the Rev. J. Scott Porter, President in the chair,—it was resolved unanimously :—"That at the first meeting of the Association of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland since the decease of Robert Andrews, Esq., LL.D., Q.C., we feel ourselves bound to record our deep sense of the loss which has been sustained by the Non-Subscribing Churches, and by the public at large, in his lamented death ; and to express our sincere sympathy with his family under their melancholy bereavement."

OBITUARY.

Died, at Castlereagh, on the 15th January, Mr. Thomas M'Fadden, formerly of Clontinacally, in his 77th year.

Died, at Gartree, Crumlin, Sarah Jane, on the 17th March, third daughter of Mr. Archibald M'Ervel, in the 16th year of her age.

Died, on Thursday evening, the 23rd March, the Rev. David Beynon, the beloved pastor of the Unitarian Congregation at St. Clears, near Caermarthen, in the 70th year of his age.

Died, at Beechmount, on the 23rd March, Annabella, wife of John Riddel, Esq.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] MAY, 1865. [No. 4.

ON FELLOWSHIP BETWEEN THOSE WHO DIFFER ABOUT MIRACLES.

THESE words form the title of a paper lately read before the Ministerial Union in New York, by the Rev. James F. Clarke, a Unitarian minister of Boston, in which the author argues in favour of ministerial communion between those who accept and those who reject Revelation. The subject of which the paper treats is one which has already created much agitation in the Unitarian Churches of these kingdoms, and is likely still farther to divide the body both in the Old and New world. The words in which the subject is stated do not exactly convey what is intended; for among those who gratefully and reverently admit the reality of Miracles, there is a diversity of opinion respecting their nature; but the question under discussion is—Can those who believe in the supernatural origin and authority of the Christian Revelation hold ministerial fellowship with those who deny anything supernatural in Jesus and his doctrine, and who regard him only as a good man, of rare natural endowments and superior virtue? And it should be borne in mind that the question is not—Can persons who hold opposite opinions on this subject hold fellowship with each other? but—Can they hold ministerial fellowship? We have always contended that no diversity of opinion on religious matters should be a barrier to social intercourse and friendly communion between man and man; and that those who in such matters may differ most widely may nevertheless enjoy intimate fellowship, and cordially co-operate in efforts for the spread of knowledge, freedom, and goodness. We had lately an illustration of such fellowship in Belfast, when, at a Temperance Conference, ministers

and laymen who differed most widely in their theological views heartily united in deliberation. Difference of opinion does not involve the sundering of social ties, or the violating of friendly relations. It is only when personal animosity overrides the better feelings of our nature, and narrow bigotry crushes the Christian spirit, that such alienation and strife arise. Between Catholic and Protestant, Trinitarian and Unitarian, Christian, Deist, and Atheist, there may be the most kindly intercourse. Every man has a right to his opinions. But when it is asked—Can those who receive and those who deny the divine mission of Jesus of Nazareth hold ministerial fellowship, we distinctly reply—*No.* To do so would be, indeed, on the part of those who regard Jesus simply as a Galilean peasant, and not the Christ—reasonable enough, for they compromise nothing in doing so: but on the part of those who regard him as the anointed Son of God, it would be a betrayal of a sacred truth, and the abandoning of what they look upon as the very foundation of their Christian faith. It has been said that the essence of the Christian religion is *goodness*, and that, if men admit its precepts, they should be regarded as Christ's disciples. There is a show of reason in this plea, for the great object of Christ's mediation is, as we believe, not by any mechanical process to change God's mind and thus save men, but to render men good in heart and life, and thus fit them for living happily and usefully here, and prepare them for the life eternal. But is it true that Christianity is simply a collection of precepts, and does it consist only in the two great commandments which enjoin love to God and love to our neighbour? These commandments had been given before Christ was born in Bethlehem, or had taught on the mount, or risen from the tomb; and the sceptical process which is so actively at work in our own Church and in others at present, would obliterate from our holy religion everything that is peculiar to it. Jesus presented himself to the world as "the sent of God": to confirm his mission was the primary object of his miracles; and by his resurrection from the dead he was "proved to be the Son of God with power"; and while he taught men to love God and to love one another, he *taught with authority:* he did not reason as

moral philosophers had done many times before, and have done often since, but he spoke as the revealer of God's will, and commanded them thus to do. Nor was his teaching confined to these precepts: he revealed God's fatherhood, the evil of sin, the efficacy of repentance, and a life of retribution after death; and these doctrines he taught *as one commissioned by God for this purpose:* he came "to bear witness to the truth."

In reply to those who coolly tell us that love to God and love to our neighbour are all that is essential in Christianity, we refer to the preaching of those who were chosen as apostles, and to whom the "anti-supernaturalists," or most of them, seem to ascribe some authority. When they proclaimed the religion of their Master, did they simply dwell on piety and charity, and expatiate on the beauty of goodness? No such thing: they laboured to exhibit Jesus as the Christ, and to persuade the people that God raised him from the dead. Is it likely that the Athenians would have scoffed at Paul, or that the Philippians would have scourged and imprisoned him, if he had merely urged them to love their neighbours, and to do good? Is it likely that the other apostles would have brought upon themselves the anger and violence of rulers and people by simply teaching what our "advanced" Unitarians represent as the essence of the Christian religion? Either the apostles understood the Gospel, or they did not. If they did not, then they may have erred in their preaching, and needlessly have placed their life in jeopardy; but if, as we believe, and as all who can reasonably claim the name of Christian believe, they did thoroughly understand and heartily embrace the religion of Christ, then that religion involves a faith in Jesus as the Christ and in his resurrection from the dead; for these are the great truths which they proclaimed, and which brought upon them the enmity of so many Jews and heathens.

It is difficult to conceive how any who have faith in Christ and in his resurrection can consent to make these doctrines "open questions," and can argue for ministerial fellowship with those who regard them as false or fabulous; for thus they rob Christianity of everything that is peculiar to it, and cast aside as unimportant that

which is its glory and its strength. What is the source of that power which the Gospel has wielded over the individual heart and life of so many millions,—training them to holiness, charity, and self-denial, — bringing strength to them in their hour of temptation, and solace in the season of distress,—and helping them calmly to contemplate the approach of death, and confidently to anticipate a life immortal? It is surely a faith in Jesus, as sent from God to proclaim his mercy and reveal his truth. And for those who hold such a faith to receive, and directly or indirectly to authorize as expounders of the Gospel those who deny and ridicule it, is, in our mind, the height of absurdity. Yet in England and America we have at present organizations for the spread of the Christian religion, embracing those who admit and those who deny the divine mission of Jesus—those who believe in his resurrection, and those who ridicule it as a silly fable. This is a breadth of liberality which it remained for our own age to present; it certainly exceeds the liberality which the apostles exhibited, or even Christ himself taught. It would strike us as strange to read in the Acts of the Apostles that while Paul and Peter and John preached the Resurrection of Christ, some other apostles, joining in their counsels and labouring with them for the spread of the Gospel, taught, amidst the applause of Sadducees and Pharisees, that Paul and Peter and John were under a mistake about Jesus being supernaturally endowed, or being miraculously raised from the dead, but that he was nevertheless a good and wise man, and that his example was worthy of their imitation! And still stranger would it appear to find in the narrative of the Evangelists an account of some Jews or Gentiles scoffing at our Lord's pretensions to a mission from God, and accusing him of stating what was untrue, and yet welcomed by him as faithful disciples! But the liberality of our times would recognize as teachers and preachers of Christianity those who believe and those who disbelieve the Gospel narrative—those who believe that Jesus was a teacher sent from God, and those who regard him as "coming of himself."

To give a show of consistency to this anomalous combination of Christian and Deist in ministerial fellowship,

we have heard it argued that Unitarianism simply denotes the *uniting* of persons of all opinions in one body! Thus the leading feature of our denomination—a protest against the unscriptural doctrine of Three Persons in One God, and the maintenance of the Sole Deity of the Father—is cast aside as of no value, and an organization aimed at which shall embrace men of all opinions and of no opinions, on the basis of "absolute religious liberty," as one of our enlightened divines teaches, or according to another, on that of "fearless free inquiry."

It has been alleged that to make a belief in the divine authority of revelation a condition of ministerial fellowship would be to create a test or impose a creed; and it is added that to do so would be to abandon our most cherished principles, and bring discredit on our free Church! It would be amusing, if it were not melancholy, to see how many have been led away by this specious argument. The opposition which Unitarians have consistently made to human dogmas that had been imposed on the Church, and had marred the simplicity of Gospel truth, is not to be directed against the Gospel itself. There is a creed which stands on higher authority than human tests and confessions; it is the belief which Peter and others held and professed—a belief in Jesus as the Christ. That creed was given to the Church by Jesus himself, and was distinctly preached by the apostles; it was made the ground of admission into the Church organization; and we cannot conceive any Church entitled to the Christian name which does not make it a fundamental principle.

We can easily understand an ecclesiastical organization on a broader basis—an organization which would rest on love to God and love to man, and would embrace within its fold, and include among its teachers, Christians and Jews, Mohammedans and heathens; but it would not be a distinctly Christian Church, nor could it place the Sacred Scriptures higher than the Vedas or the Koran. For such an association many seem to be preparing, and, if it were only inaugurated, we might hope to see the advocates of "absolute religious liberty" flocking into it: they would thus relieve themselves from the false position which at present they hold, and they would at the same time confer incalculable benefit on the Christian Uni-

tarian Church, whose vitality they are wasting, and whose foundation principles they are doing their best to undermine.

TRUST IN GOD.

[ORIGINAL.]

When thy day is at the brightest,
And thy path is gay with flow'rs,
And upborne on wings of gladness
Fleet the happy careless hours—
When thy heart doth fondly number
All its treasures o'er and o'er,
Knowing not what boon or blessing
Life can add unto its store—

Ah rejoice! but yet with trembling;
Give thy thanks where thanks are due;
Set no idol up for worship,
Lest it fall, and crush *thee* too.
In the midst of joy and pleasure,
Turn thy thoughts from earth away,
Lest the hour of sorrow find thee
Comfortless and cast away.

When thy day is at the darkest,
And heav'n's light seems faint and far—
When the night is black and stormy,
With no ray of moon or star—
When in legions, armed and ruthless,
Griefs beset thine onward way,
And thou pinest for the ending
Of life's weary, hopeless day—

Then look up!—there is no sorrow
In the land beyond the grave;
There is rest, and hope, and comfort,
More than human souls can crave.
Dost thou suffer? Christ has suffered—
Bow the knee, and kiss the rod;
Bear thee bravely, humbly trusting
In the mercy of thy God.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.

SUCCESSION OF MINISTERS.

1. 1646—1674. Patrick Adair.
2. 1675—1714. John Campbell.*
3. 1715—1734. William Taylor.
4. 1728—1803. John Lewson.
5. 1793—1851. Thomas Alexander.
6. 1833—1836. James Mulligan.
7. 1837—1839. James M'Dowell.
8. 1839 ——. Robert Hall.

The first reference that I have met with to a Presbyterian Congregation as existing in this most picturesque and romantic parish, which is situated on the coast between Larne and Glenarm, is shortly subsequent to June 10, 1642. On that day met in Carrickfergus the first regularly constituted Presbytery that ever was held in Ireland. It was composed of the Presbyterian chaplains who were connected with the Scottish army, which, in that year, was sent to this country under the command of Major-General Robert Monro, to trample out the embers of the Irish rebellion. On the news of the formation of this

* I am not quite certain about the dates of Mr. Campbell's ministry in Cairncastle. I have seen it stated somewhere—although I cannot at present lay my hand on the reference—that he was not ordained there until 1689. But I am inclined to think that this must be a mistake. In the first place, the Minutes of the Antrim meeting for 1689 make no mention of any such ordination; and in the next place, in "the list of the Presbyterian ministers in Ireland," dated March, 1689, which is given in the Appendix to Dr. Reid's 2nd volume, appears the name of John Campbell, as minister of Cairncastle, with an indication that he was supposed to be then in Scotland. From July, 1675, to February, 1683, there is most unfortunately a gap in the Minutes of the Antrim meeting, so that we cannot now know the proceedings of the brethren between these two dates. But at the latter date appears the name of John Campbell amongst the ministers present; and, although he is not there designated as minister of Cairncastle, and although at that time there seem to have been at least two John Campbells connected with the meeting, one of whom is called "Mr. John Campbell of Belfast," yet as I never heard of any minister of Cairncastle intervening between Mr. Adair and Mr. Campbell, I think the presumption is in favour of the list as given above. I have therefore named Mr. Campbell as the second minister of Cairncastle, and represented his incumbency as extending from shortly after Mr. Adair's removal to Belfast, in 1674, till shortly before Mr. Taylor's ordination in Cairncastle, in 1715. About these two dates there is no uncertainty.

Presbytery spreading in the neighbourhood, different parishes made application to be supplied, through its means, with Gospel ordinances, and amongst the number was the parish with which we are now concerned; "Upon which" (to quote the words of the Adair MS., which was written by the first minister of Cairncastle) "the Presbytery moved that there should be elderships erected with the consent of the Congregations, and that by their help a present supply might be procured, and in due time ministers be settled among them. This motion of the Presbytery was very acceptable to those Congregations, as appeared by their immediate and earnest address to the Presbytery for ministers to be sent to that effect, which was also readily done by the Presbytery who sent ministers to divers Congregations who were first in a case for eldership (including Cairncastle), and the elderships being erected in these places, there began a little appearance of a formed Church in the country." From this it should seem that even before the period referred to in the preceding extract, a Presbyterian "Congregation," in some form or other, had existed in Cairncastle; but if so, I have never met with any record of its history, and it certainly did not obtain the services of a settled minister until some four years afterwards (May 7, 1646), so that, with this latter date, its proper Congregational existence may be said to begin.*

I.—Patrick Adair (1646 to 1674), the first Presbyterian minister of Cairncastle, was ordained to that

* In the disastrous times of 1641 and 1642, many of the Presbyterian inhabitants of Cairncastle had found shelter in the Castle of Ballygally, within their own parish, which was held for a time against the insurgents by its proprietor, Mr. James Shaw; and, on his retiring to Scotland with his family, was garrisoned by part of his tenantry under the command of Mr. James Cromie. I have also heard that about the same time, the Presbyterians of this parish, in common with other Presbyterian tenants of the Earl of Antrim of these days, incurred the undying resentment of that well-known nobleman and his successors, by signing a memorial against him to the King, in which they accused him of being the prime mover of the late rebellion. Tradition further states, that in Lord Antrim's rent office, at Glenarm, was kept for many years a paper which was called "the black list" and which contained the names of the Presbyterian ministers and laymen who had subscribed this offensive document, some of whom, being tenants on the Antrim estate, were, as opportunity offered, made to suffer for their undutiful conduct towards their landlord.

charge on the 7th of May, 1646, by the Antrim meeting of ministers, under the patronage of Mr. James Shaw, of Ballygally.* Mr. Adair was one of the most distinguished Presbyterian ministers that have ever appeared in the North of Ireland. His ministry, first in Cairncastle, and afterwards in Belfast, extended over a period of very nearly fifty years, during all which time he received many signal tokens of the confidence and esteem of his brethren, being employed by them on all occasions —and these were not few—which required prudence, tact, and incorruptible integrity in the management of their affairs. The excellent character and singular attainments of the first minister of Cairncastle, are well summarized by the author of "Presbyterian Loyalty" in the following words:—"Mr. Adair was a man of great natural parts and wisdom, eminent piety and exemplary holiness, great ministerial gravity and authority,—endued with savoury and most edifying gifts for his sacred function, wherein he was laborious, painful, and faithful; was a constant, curious, and accurate observer of all public occurrences; and with all these rare qualities, had not only the blood and descent, but the spirit and just decorum of a gentlemen." With reference to the latter part of this extract, I may mention that Mr. P. Adair, of Cairncastle, was the son of Rev. William Adair, Minister of Ayr, in Scotland, who had been sent to Ulster in 1644, to administer the Solemn League and Covenant to the Irish Presbyterians, and who was a brother of Sir Robert Adair, of Kilhilt, in Wigtownshire, and afterwards of

* Mr. Shaw, who was a cadet of a highly respectable family, which for many generations had been located at Greenock in Scotland, settled in Cairncastle very early in the 17th century. In 1624 he built the Castle of Ballygally, which is situated at the head of a beautiful bay of the same name, about four miles from Larne, and is now occupied as a Coast Guard station. For many generations the Shaws of Ballygally maintained a highly influential position amongst the gentry of Ulster, during all which time they were the faithful and generous patrons of the congregation which their ancestor had founded. But the last male representative of the family having embarked in business, and being unfortunate therein, sold the estate, some years ago, to the late Mr. E. J. Agnew, of Kilwaughter, and died unmarried in London in 1850, leaving sisters who still survive. These latter circumstances give a melancholy significance to the family motto, which is inscribed on the escutcheon above the doorway of Ballygally,—"God's providence is my inheritance." Alas! they have now no other.

Ballymena, in County Antrim.* In the case of Mr. Adair of Cairncastle, this was increased by his marriage with his cousin, who was a daughter of Sir Robert Adair, so that socially, as well as professionally, the position of this distinguished minister was most respectable. Mr. Adair's MS. History details the part which he took in the various public occurrences of the day. With some of these we are not now particularly concerned; but the following extracts have a personal and local interest in connexion with the first minister of Cairncastle and his Congregation. In January, 1653, Mr. Adair and Mr. Archibald Ferguson (Antrim) were sent by their brethren to Dublin, as Commissioners to the Parliamentary Lord-General Fleetwood, to seek relief from the oath called "The Engagement," which was at this time pressed on the Ulster Presbyterians, and in which all persons were required to swear to be "faithful to the Commonwealth of England, as now established without a king or House of Lords" On this occasion, the two ministers from the North were referred by Fleetwood "to a meeting of officers, who met in the Castle of Dublin, of all sorts and sizes of them." One of these officers, an Anabaptist, replying to an argument alleged by Mr. Ferguson on the score of conscience, had said "a Papist would and might say as much for himself, and pretend conscience as well as you." The disparaging comparison was too much for the patience of Mr. Adair, who, with a courage which, under the circumstances of the times, did him infinite honour, replied, "Sir, under favour, it's a mistake to

* The Adairs of Ballymena, whose present head is Sir Robert Shafto Adair of Flixton Hall, Baronet, are of Norman descent, and more recently of Anglo-Irish extraction. Their name was originally Fitzgerald. The founder of their family was a young man called Robert Fitzgerald (a son of the Earl of Desmond), who lived in the latter part of the 14th century. He was the owner of the lands of Adare in Ireland, where, having at the time stated, killed in a family feud a person of distinction, and a powerful combination being formed against him, he fled to Galloway in Scotland. There he took the name of Robert Adare, or Adair, from his forfeited Milesian patrimony, and being hospitably received at various baronial houses, and obtaining for himself, by means which were not uncommon in those days, a Scotch estate in place of the Irish one which he had left behind him, he founded a family which was for some time known as the Adairs of Portree, afterwards of Kilhilt, and now among ourselves as the Adairs of Ballymena, where they are deservedly respected and beloved.—(*Sir Andrew Agnew's Sheriffs of Galloway, p.* 50.)

compare our consciences with Papists', for Papist consciences could digest to kill Protestant kings, but so would not ours, to which our principles are contrary. This harsh expression, reflecting on many there who had a hand in the King's murder, procured a great silence, some drawing their hats down on their faces, and others were angry." However, the brethren returned home with no more security than they went; and shortly afterwards (April 1, 1653) Parliamentary Commissioners arrived from Dublin in Belfast, who issued proclamations, summoning all parties concerned to appear before them at Carrickfergus, on the 13th of April, "to render an account of their affection and fidelity to the present Government. But they first sent soldiers to each minister's house—there being then but seven in the country—all at the one time, who were to search all papers and letters in their houses, and bring them along from the ministers." The result of this search in the case of Mr. Adair, of Cairncastle, is thus narrated by that minister himself. "The soldiers narrowly searched all, but found papers with none but Mr. Adair. They took from him every paper, though to never so little purpose, for they could not distinguish papers, there being none among sixteen soldiers and a sergeant who took the papers that could read. Among the papers they took, there was one bundle which contained the Presbytery's representation against the Sectaries and that party, and another declaring the horridness of their murdering the King, with other papers much reflecting on their party. This bundle they took away with them in a cloak-bag among others, though Mr. Adair had used all means to preserve it, knowing they might take much occasion against the brethren upon the sight of these papers. However they took it along in one of the cloak-bags which were full of papers. That night the sergeant kept one of the cloak-bags in the chamber where he lay, about two miles from Mr. Adair's house, and in this was that bundle. The maid of the house, hearing a report that these were Mr. Adair's papers, resolved to restore some of them to him again. And so she went in the night, when the sergeant and soldiers were asleep, and quietly brought a bundle of papers out of the cloak-bag, not knowing what papers they were. This bundle was

that which Mr. Adair only cared for; and she sent it to him next morning."*

Annoyed by the refractory conduct of the Ulster Presbyterians at this time, the Parliamentary party conceived the idea of "transplanting" them wholesale from the North of Ireland to certain districts in the province of Munster. A proclamation to this effect was actually issued by "the Commissioners for the settling and securing the province of Ulster;" and certain leading Presbyterians, including Mr. Adair's father-in-law, Sir Robert Adair, of Ballymena, and his patron, Mr. Shaw, of Ballygally, were sent to Munster to examine the allotted lands. But nothing ultimately came of this notable scheme "for settling and securing the province of Ulster"; and the time was now approaching when, political parties having exchanged places, Presbyterians were called upon to endure even greater persecutions than they had suffered under the Commonwealth of England, from the very people for whose sakes they had refused to take "the engagement"; I mean the Royal House of Stuart, that House which Presbyterians were mainly instrumental in recalling to the throne of these kingdoms, which no amount of adversity could teach either wisdom or honour, and which, from first to last, was indeed "accursed" both of God and man.

Up to the year 1661, there is every reason to believe that Mr. Adair preached in the parish Church of Cairncastle, according to a rather lax arrangement which I have explained in previous papers. But in this year he was, in common with other Presbyterian ministers similarly situated, ejected from his Church and benefice by the restored but not reformed Stuarts, through the unworthy instrumentality of Jeremy Taylor, who was

* I am in every way inclined to believe that the scene of this smart trick, on the part of a quick-witted servant girl, was the Town of Larne. Mr. Adair's dwelling-house, where his papers were seized, and which is still standing, was distant about one mile from the Cairncastle meeting-house, in the direction of Larne Two miles further on the road by which the soldiers would be returning to Carrickfergus, would bring them to the Town of Larne. In addition to which, the phrase, "maid of the house," appears to indicate an inn or place of public entertainment, and in those days there was nothing of that kind in the neighbourhood specified, except in the Town of Larne.

then Bishop of Down and Connor. To that Church he was never allowed to return, and therefore it is probable that shortly afterwards the Presbyterians of Cairncastle, being thus thrown on their own resources, built for themselves a meeting-house, as it is stated that about 1668, meeting-houses generally began to be built for such Presbyterian Congregations as were then organized, including, of course, Cairncastle, which was undoubtedly at that time in that condition. This meeting-house, which is still standing, though considerably modified from its original size and form, was built on a part of the Ballygally estate, and there can be little doubt that its site was the free gift of the Squire Shaw of that day to his co-religionists in Cairncastle.

But before entering his new meeting-house, Mr. Adair was, in 1663, the object of another raid, which was made into his peaceful and secluded parish by a party of soldiers, who, on this occasion, seized not only his papers, but himself. In this year the Presbyterian ministers of the North of Ireland were involved in great trouble, on account of their alleged complicity in Colonel Blood's Plot against the Government of the day. Orders were issued from Dublin to apprehend the ministers, and send them up to Dublin by a guard. Amongst the number who were to be thus seized was especially named Mr. Adair, the minister of Cairncastle, who, in his Manuscript History, gives the following account of his arrest :—"Though my Lord Massereene was a Privy Counsellor, yet he knew not at the first of sending for Mr. Adair. But upon knowledge of it he went to the Duke of Ormond who was Lord Lieutenant, and spoke as much for Mr. Adair's loyalty as Lord Mount Alexander had done for Mr. Stewart (Donaghadee). He so far prevailed that Mr. Adair should come of himself to the Duke. This letter he wrote to Mr. Adair and sent it by post. But before it came, Mr. Adair had been apprehended in his own house by a party of the Earl of Donegall's troop, and secured close prisoner in the gaol of Carrickfergus for three nights. Lord Massereene also wrote a letter to his lady's nephew, Sir Arthur Chichester, then Lieutenant of the troop, declaring the Duke's pleasure, and that if Mr. Adair were taken before that letter came, he

should use him civilly. This he did, accordingly, sending only one trooper along with Mr. Adair in company with him and his servant, and also wrote a favourable letter to the Duke by that trooper in Mr. Adair's behalf. When Mr. Adair came to Dublin, that noble Lord (Massereene) was pleased to intercede again with the Duke, that Mr. Adair should be committed to his custody, he becoming bail for his appearance, which the Duke, upon perusal of Sir Arthur's letter, easily granted. Thus Mr. Adair had a free confinement (!!) in Lord Massereene's house and the city for three months thereafter; and though he sent divers petitions to the Duke to call and examine him of that plot, yet he was never called nor examined; but after three months he was remanded to his own house by a warrant under the Duke's hand, with only a certification that he would live peaceably." So that this storm also blew over, and Mr. Adair was allowed to continue peaceably in Cairncastle, until his "transportation" therefrom to Belfast in 1674.

(*To be continued.*)

COMMUNION THOUGHTS.

Another opportunity has recently been granted to us of being present, "in thankful remembrance," at that beautiful ordinance—the Lord's Supper—so simple in itself, yet symbolizing so much. As these half-yearly celebrations recur again and again, and the fervent feelings and aspirations of earlier years have changed their character with our deepening experiences of life, we are in some danger of looking on this ordinance as merely a soothing and interesting service which it is pleasant and right, as well as customary, to attend—an outward sign of church-membership, but not as implying any special self-dedication to one who gave his life for the world, and who desires that his followers should share the spirit which prompted him to such a sacrifice. Easily, gratefully, devotedly, we may commemorate him when we sit in the silent harmony of many spirits at his Table, when it

seems almost as if memory brought from the dim past those wondrous scenes in that divine life once manifested on the earth, so vividly do they rise before our minds in this quiet hour of meditation. So near, so dear to us are those scenes that they make part of our spiritual being, and the ages between us and them are as nothing. Freshly do our "hearts burn within us," as if we were even now holding converse with our risen Lord. But we know from sad experience that this vision fades, the celestial presence recedes from our consciousness, and Christ is forgotten amidst the jar of passions, the allurements of self-indulgence, and the tumult and successive interests of the world. Is it to be always so? Our habitual remembrance of Christ in our daily life and conversation, depends not on the fervour of our feelings at impressive services, but rather on the earnestness with which we aspire after, and the perseverance with which we aim at, a closer walk with God, and on the consecration—constantly renewed—of our own will to God's. Is it not true that we rest satisfied with a low degree of goodness, of spirituality? How many of us practically count all things loss that we may win Christ,—that we may be filled with his Spirit, and earnestly diffuse it, make it recognized, and awaken other souls to share in the great salvation? We want more of this *diffusive* energy of Christian love in our denomination. Our inward life is perhaps too solitary, and we live and move too much within the pale of prescribed custom. Surely our frequent meetings together in the sanctuary ought to help us to a closer union with each other in spiritual things, and in the practical working out of the great truths and principles of our inestimable faith. Is it because we are so familiar with Christ's conceptions of the grandeur of the soul, and with his instructions regarding unworldliness and disinterestedness, that we can listen so coldly, saying with our lips, "Thou, Lord, hast the words of eternal life," yet with our lives proving we think a man's life *does* consist in the abundance of the things which he possesseth, and that it is very desirable indeed to lay up treasures upon earth, though it may be well to secure a little reversion of treasure in heaven, by a little easy almsgiving and attendance upon ordinances, and

very proper conduct in the general concerns of life? How long shall we be content to be without that glow of divine love which shall take us out of our comfortable selves, to labour, feel, suffer for the wretched and sinful, —that love which shall *constrain* us in some way to make the world a little better and happier? Alas! without some such glow of love urging us to a nobler life, can we be sure that we have entered into true *communion* with the Eternal Spirit?—that our prayers uttered daily, it may be, not having sought, have ever found Him? Do we pray that He may be revealed to us and in us at any cost of outward good,—that we may reverently wait for and obey all the leadings of his providence whithersoever they may conduct us, and all the whispers of His Spirit to whatever sacrifices they may prompt us? Is it our daily endeavour, never wholly lost sight of, to become *like* that beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased? Is growth into his image felt to be the chief aim, and do ministrations of love like his, according to our measure, form at least some part of the employment of our lives? Are we doing all we should do, as members of the Christian Church, to seek and to save those who are lost or in danger of being so? With our intellectual enlightenment, are we sufficiently on our guard against spiritual apathy, and sufficiently prayerful and humble to avoid a tendency to regard Christ with distant admiration and respect, as sustaining a certain official relation between man and God, rather than as the personal Saviour and Inspirer of every disciple that abides in his love? Some such self-questioning and reflections would become the solemn and repeated professions of attachment to Jesus which we make at his table. Oh, that he may open in our souls the fountain of living waters, and may it overflow for the refreshing of many!

I MUST not consider doing good as an accidental pleasure, but make it the business of life. Let me seek, not wait for opportunities. Let the active spirit of Christian charity be ever watchful in discerning objects, and persevering in devising means of usefulness. Love is happiness; he who grows in love grows in happiness.—*Channing.*

NARRATIVES FROM REAL LIFE.

RICHARD S—— AND HIS FAMILY.

RICHARD S—— and his wife were two aged persons in poor circumstances, but of good character and much respected. They were converts to Unitarianism under the ministry of my predecessor. During an acquaintance of ten years I had full opportunity of observing the power of religion on their minds, and of seeing it to be, under the most afflictive circumstances, their comfort, their hope, their stay. They had two daughters, who were married and settled in life, to whom the aged parents looked as the solace of their declining years.

In the autumn of 18—, both the daughters, together with their mother, fell into a rapid decline. The mother and eldest daughter (Martha) lay ill in the same house,—the other daughter (Elizabeth) in a house at a short distance. I regularly visited them all three. Both daughters were mothers, and ardently clung to life on account of their children, particularly Martha, in whom there appeared to be much less resignation than in Elizabeth. Day after day they got weaker, and at length it became evident the hour of departure was very near. With a heavy heart I had to accompany the poor old man from the bedside of one dying daughter to that of the other dying daughter, and from thence again to the bedside of his dying wife. Never shall I forget the distressing scene in the chamber of Elizabeth. Her husband was weeping at the foot of the bed; her little children knelt around; her father supported her in his arms, and cried aloud in prayer. It was a most solemn season. The prayer consisted more of ejaculations and broken sentences than of connected words. "My child," said the old man, "may God support thee in passing through the dark valley, and receive thee at last to his glorious kingdom!" Before we left the room, we exchanged farewells with the hope of meeting in heaven, and in a few hours afterwards poor Elizabeth was no longer an inhabitant of this world.

In less than a fortnight after Martha also died. Her children and her husband (a worthless man) lay near her

heart, and it was difficult to say, "Thy will be done!" But she *did* say it, and in the spirit of resignation and hope departed in peace. In a short time the mother followed her daughters. She had long been waiting for the final change, and when it came she was prepared to meet it. A few hours before she breathed her last, she spoke of the great consolation she enjoyed from her Unitarian views of the Gospel. She expressed her confidence in the love of the all-merciful Father, and died rejoicing in humble Christian hope.

She was interred in the burial-ground belonging to the Chapel. The old man stood by my side as I committed her remains to the dust. He shook his hoary hairs with anguish as his eyes rested on the coffin and the grave which contained the remains of the partner of his days, but it was anguish mixed with resignation. His religion wiped away his falling tears and cheered his drooping heart.

I called one evening, shortly after the funeral, at his cottage. There were some persons within, so we walked into the field. The moon was shining brightly in the heavens, the busy hum of the distant town was hushed to rest, and all around was peaceful and serene. The loveliness and quietude of the night impressed me very deeply, and my heart was full. "Richard," said I, "God is good." "He is, master." "I hope, my friend, you can rest upon his goodness *now*." "I can sir," said he. "His goodness has supported me under these heavy trials; my trust therefore is in him. I am fully satisfied, from his goodness to me so many years, that he will not forsake me in my old age; and though my lot is hard, I know and rest upon the promise he has given, that 'according to my day, so my strength shall be.'" We conversed thus together for a considerable time, and I left him, more and more convinced in my own mind, from what I had seen and heard, of the value of Unitarian Christianity, particularly among the poor.

Old Richard is still living. He is one of our most constant attendants and communicants; and though poor, maintains an honest character, and is respected and beloved. He is servant to Mr. G——, a clothier in the town, and has been in his service upwards of forty years.

WILLIAM H——.

William H—— and his wife—aged persons—converts to Unitarianism under the ministry of Mr. J——, consistent members of our Church twenty-seven years, near twenty of which William has been Deacon. They have brought up a large family creditably, and have always maintained an excellent character for honesty, industry, and piety. Some time ago William's was a house of severe affliction and distress. His wife and daughter had long been ill, and were supposed to be drawing near death. They lay in separate beds in the same room, and old William, with the occasional help of a neighbour, attended upon both. It pleased God, however, to spare the daughter and to take the mother.

Some time ago, I went one evening to the house of affliction. The poor old woman was dying fast. She was torn with convulsions, and her speech was gone with the exception of her being just able to articulate indistinctly, as she constantly did, "Mercy, mercy!" I prayed, and William prayed afterwards; and oh, what a prayer did he utter! How fervently did he pour out his soul in behalf of his dying wife, and how earnestly did he thank God for the glorious views he had been led to entertain of the Divine government and character, and for the full persuasion he enjoyed that, dark as the scene was around him, still all was right! After prayer I sat down on a stool by the fireside, and with a view of comforting, said, "William, I have been reading and thinking a good deal to-day of the beautiful description given in the Revelations of the city of the new Jerusalem. One expression struck me very forcibly—'God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.' Now, what a delightful thought it is that all tears—the last tear—shall be wiped away! I wonder what our last tear will be shed for. Mine, I think, will be on account of sin." "Sir," said the old man, "much as I have suffered, and do still suffer on account of sin, I do not think your last tear will be mine. Mine, I believe, will be the tear of gratitude for the many mercies God has bestowed upon me!" As I left the room, and considered the circumstances of affliction and poverty in which William was now placed, and yet

that he was able to say this, I thought of the reality of religion, and was reminded of the words of Job, "I have *heard* of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee." William is very infirm, and has nothing to support him beyond his scanty parish allowance.

FREE PRAYER *VERSUS* FORMS OF PRAYER.

The attention of the readers of *The Christian Unitarian* has been lately drawn to Forms of Prayer, in the review which has appeared in its pages of Dr. Lee's Volume on the Reform of the Church of Scotland, and afterwards in an article from the pen of a correspondent; and I must candidly admit that there is much force in the objections that have been brought forward against what is technically termed "Free Prayer," and in the arguments that have been adduced in favour of Forms of Prayer. It is notoriously the case that ministers in Presbyterian pulpits frequently give, from Sunday to Sunday, under the absurd name of Free Prayer, the same unvaried round of sentences, often ill-constructed and unimpressive, and wanting the beauty and unction which are commonly found in Liturgical Services: but it should be borne in mind that such devotional services arise from the absence of Free Prayer, and are to be traced either to the indolence or the incapacity of the minister. I have heard a Presbyterian divine so regularly give the same prayer, that when the first sentence was uttered, I could anticipate every word in it even to the closing ascription of praise: and not only in the public services of the sanctuary, but even in family worship or the visitation of the sick, there was the same hackneyed composition, used alike in seasons of mourning and of joy, at the bedside of the dying or the couch of the convalescent. Where there is so much indolence, indifference, or incapacity, it is a folly to talk of Free Prayer. A. B. has objected that where there is not a Form of Service, ministers "pay very little attention to the devotional part of the service, and generally scramble it over with indecent haste, in order that they may get to the sermon on which

their entire pains have been expended." This is sometimes so; but much more frequently the devotional service is protracted to an extravagant length—the prayer reaching to half an hour or forty minutes, and taxing to an unmerciful degree both the body and the mind of the hearers. Whether it be from the inordinate length and the unimpressive character of the introductory services, or from a growing indifference on the part of certain hearers, I cannot say; but it is painfully true that many seem to think they are time enough in the House of *Prayer* if they come in when the second hymn is being sung, or when the preacher is giving out "the text": and this disgrace of Presbyterianism is stereotyped in the phrase which its adherents employ in speaking of public worship. Christians whom they look down upon as ignorant or superstitious, always speak of "going to prayers," while they, with more truth than they mean to express, say that they are "going to sermon."

There is another argument overlooked by A. B., which now-a-days has some force in our Non-Subscribing Churches. The rapid inroads of Rationalism have sometimes threatened to excommunicate Christ from his own church, and to make it little more than a temple of Deism. I have heard, even in the most important seasons of Christian worship, prayers in which there was no reference direct or indirect to Christ, or to God's revelation through him—prayers that would have come as appropriately from Thomas Paine, as from the lips of our "Christian" pastor. Now there is so much Christian sentiment still prevading the public mind in all our churches that no Service Book could be introduced, which would not be essentially, distinctly, and emphatically Christian; and thus, much good might be secured. I leave it for those who have a morbid sensibility about the profession of any Christian doctrines to get rid of the objection, which might be made against a Service Book, of fixing a creed on the church: for evidently, the Book of Common Prayer is as much the Confesssion of Faith of the English Church, as are the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. Such is not to me an objection against a Form of Prayer, but, on the contrary, a strong argument in its favour.

Notwithstanding, however, the opinion of Dr. Lee and A. B., and the confessedly increasing tendency in our churches to adopt "Forms of Prayer," I am old-fashioned and Presbyterian enough to lean to the unpopular side, and plead for Free Prayer in our pulpits as a valuable means of awakening and strengthening sentiments of devotion in the hearers. When men are too indolent or too worldly-minded to exercise whatever gifts of prayer they may possess, a Service Book does little to help; their right course would be to leave a ministry for which they are wholly unfitted. What better influence is exercised by such drones when they read a religious service? I have heard such a man read the funeral service of the English Church, many parts of which possess such exquisite beauty, at the burial of one whose death had filled a neighbourhood with sorrow, and the effect was most powerless and chilling. How incomparably more impressive and improving would even three sentences of Free Prayer have been, embodying the human grief and the Christian faith of the assembled multitude.

The familiar words of the minister who has but one or two forms of introductory service for his people, cease to impress because of their familiarity: but see how this objection tells at least with as much force against printed services. With these the people are intimately acquainted, so that they can almost repeat them *verbatim* from memory; and the result is that they cease to be impressive. This is admittedly the case in the Established Church, where you may see many of the congregation repeating the words, while at the same time they are looking at some new bonnet in the next pew, or at some dashing stranger whom the verger is showing to a seat. And have we not all felt the injurious results of familiar phrases in our devotions, when we are repeating those simple and holy petitions embodied in the Lord's Prayer? Judging from myself, I believe it requires an effort to realise the meaning of the words as we utter them. Besides, Forms of Prayer bind down the minister to one particular tone of thought, if I may so speak. Now, the changing scenes and events in any parish would naturally require a variety of tone. Some event may have occurred that has spread joy and gladness through the congrega-

tion; or more probably one of those calamities may have arisen that at times plunge a whole neighbourhood into grief, or fill them with awe. How desirable that the services in the sanctuary should take their complexion from such incidents, and thus give expression to the Christian feelings, hopes, and aspirations of the worshippers. The objection that the hearers do not know what the minister means to say, and therefore can only listen as he speaks, and not join him, has less force than at first sight may appear. A well-qualified and judicious minister will never tax the faith or offend the good sense and Christian feeling of the people. The praise and prayer which he leads embody sentiments and petitions in which he and his flock are as much agreed as are the parson and people in any church in which a service-book is used. Unity of sentiment is all that is needed for unity of worship. A variety of language only gives freshness and force to the sentiments expressed. Among those who employ and those who object to free prayer, cases arise in which free prayer is approved and practised. If some bereavement occurs in a family, the minister, in asking the afflicted ones to accompany him to a throne of grace, does not commonly use a prayer with which all are familiar; but he seeks to express, in such words as the occasion prompts, the sorrows, the supplications, and the hopes of the mourning household. And in visits to the sick, what stereotyped forms would be sufficient to meet all cases? —and who that has been present during a minister's visit at a bed of sickness, has found any inconvenience in joining in the prayer that was offered? The solemnity and sanctity of the scene banish all idea of his being merely a listener and not a pray-er. I have said that there is much in the arguments advanced in Dr. Lee's work, and in the communication of A. B., by whom the case has been well put. Perhaps the method most conducive to the cultivation of piety in a Church in which there is much diversity of opinion on this subject, would be to combine free prayer and forms of prayer; but in such a case I would contend strongly for free prayer after sermon, not, as A. B. says, to pray the sermon over again, but to lead the congregation to join in prayer for the increase of that spirit, the strengthening of that virtue, or

the forgiveness of that sin of which the sermon treated. In one point, however, A. B. falls into what I think a great mistake. He leads us to suppose that the want of a liturgical service is the cause of young persons deserting the simple Church of their fathers, and joining the Established Church. It is, on the contrary, notorious that the great influence which leads many young persons Church-ward is *fashion*. It must go hard with them sometimes to join in prayers and confessions which shock their better feelings, and doom to eternal torment the parents to whom, under God, they owe whatever of virtue, respectability, and worldly wealth they possess. I am sure many of them would be thankful that there was no such service-book; but *fashion* reconciles them even to such monstrous statements and denunciations. Indeed, so little predilection have they to forms of prayer, that when any curate comes into the parish who happens to have "a gift of prayer," he becomes amazingly popular, and is extolled by the young enthusiasts as a "dear good man." Forms of prayer, judiciously combined with free prayer, might serve some of our churches; but forms of prayer, employed to the exclusion of free prayer, would go far to extinguish them.

C. D.

CORRESPONDENCE.

RECENT MEETING OF THE MANCHESTER DISTRICT SUNDAY SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

Dear Sir,—A resolution of the Committee of the Northern Sunday School Association sent me to England to respond, as their deputation, to a kind request of the Manchester Sunday-School Association, that some one from the sister island should be present at their Annual Meeting. I had once before attended a meeting of the kind, but then it was many years back, and the Association has grown to almost gigantic proportions since that time, has, in truth, gathered much strength and proportionate success from year to year. I imagine that your readers with yourself will be interested in a brief narrative of what I witnessed on the occasion; it may give us here hope and encouragement in our work. We want more union, and, let me add, more heart among ourselves, with more of faith in God's purposes through our endeavours. We have

labourers in the field, active, zealous, and faithful; but they are by far too few, and under their manifold discouragements may be ready to say, in the very impatience of their souls, "We have laboured in vain; we have spent our strength for nought." But our friends must not despond, nor slacken their efforts. When Paul and his companions bent their feeble, trembling steps towards Rome, travel-stained, wearied with perils endured by sea and by land, the world against them and the world's law,—they were met on their way to the imperial city by certain disciples, and the sight of these dear and faithful friends gave the wayfarers joy,—they thanked God and took courage. Thus may we do, thus persevere to the close of our days.

According to announcement, the gathering—for such it may truly be called—took place this year at Monton, some four miles from the centre of Manchester, once a retired village, now a semi-rural suburb, destined in no long time to be joined to the great manufacturing capital of the North. It, however, retains some of its primitive features, especially in the old Dissenting Chapel, a plain, substantial building, standing almost alone on a pretty green, with a neat and commodious school-house, a nearly new structure. My old friend, Mr. Poynting, worthily occupies the pulpit, ministering to a large and flourishing congregation, whilst in all affairs connected with the Church and Schools he is ably assisted by Mr. Dendy, who, in quitting the ministry, retains all that is valuable in the profession—earnestness and devoted zeal in the work. Long may they both be spared to carry out the various judicious plans which they have commenced, and which are worked with so much success.

From the commencement of the Association, Good Friday has been set apart for the Annual Meeting. I may remark, that this day is held in more honour in England, than in the North of Ireland or in Scotland; it is universally there a "shut-shop day," and is consequently well fitted for social gatherings, especially of a religious kind. The Sunday School meeting circulates from town to town round a considerable area, thus increasing the interest, whilst giving opportunities for those engaged in the cause, but who live at great distances from each other, to meet from year to year to shake hands and to ask after their common welfare. Such was the effect of the meeting last Good Friday. The day proved unexpectedly wet,—now and then the rain fell heavily. The weather, doubtless, operated to prevent some persons from being present, yet, with all deductions from this cause, the meeting was one of the largest and most inspiriting I ever attended. Wonderful, and yet to me delightful, is it to relate that a Unitarian meeting-house was filled to overflowing, that many of the Congregation were compelled to stand during the whole service, whilst the spacious pews were closely packed, and very many persons could not come into the building at all; there was no room for them, even at the door. The sermon was preached by the Rev. J. Drummond, of Cross Street, Manchester, who took his text from John xii. 24.—"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." It is but bare justice to say that the discourse was admirably adapted to the occasion. Our

brother well depicted the effect of the Redeemer's love, in the self-sacrifice so many of his followers had manifested in every age—the corn of wheat dying had brought forth much fruit. A short time succeeding, the service was given up to social greetings among knots of friends, variously grouped. The "dinner bell" announced that a substantial cold repast, at a nearly nominal price, was on the tables, which were quickly occupied by between four and five hundred persons, whilst others were entertained at the houses of members of the Congregation. At two, the meeting for business was held in the Chapel, Rev. J. Wright, of Bury, in the Chair. As in the morning, the place was densly crowded, the Chairman pleasantly remarking that he was called on to preside over a "packed" meeting. The reports presented were of a very interesting kind, but as these will soon be in the hands of the public, I do not think it necessary to give any analysis of them here. Generally, they were hopeful in tone, and they spoke of much work being done during the past year, but the terrible cotton famine, inducing privations of the most painful kind, had operated unfavourably on the members and the attendance, though not to any great extent. Mr. Gibson was, to the great regret of his friends, obliged from failing health to resign his office of stipendiary school visitor. He had visited many schools since his connexion with the Association, had suggested several alterations in the mode of tuition, which, wherever adopted, had been found improvements, and had, in conjunction with Mr. Freestone, of Rochdale, delivered lectures to the teachers on week nights, all which had produced most satisfactory results. A most warm recognition of the presence of the deputations from London and Belfast was then made. Mr. Wade, from London, in energetic terms acknowledged the welcome, followed by myself, on behalf of the Northern Sunday School Association. A wish from the Chair was expressed that the London and Irish Societies should send deputations to the Manchester Association annually, which was caught up by the meeting, and ratified by acclamation. The announcement that the tea was getting cold in the school-room rather prematurely broke up the meeting; but after justice had been done to the profusion of good things spread before the visiters, the tables were once more cleared, and the company reassembled to take part in the more miscellaneous evening meeting. Here the Chair was taken by Mr. Dendy, who kept us alive by the pertinence of his remarks, and the happiness of his mode of illustration, all done in the best temper and taste. Mr. Freestone read a paper on the best mode of conveying instruction to Sunday scholars, very practical, and at the same time, very suggestive. An interesting conversation ensued, the tone of which was due to Mr. Freestone's paper, and to some stirring remarks from our friend, Brooke Herford, who engages with the whole man in whatever he undertakes. The inexorable railway train broke up at a somewhat early hour this pleasing and profitable meeting. Many who had come from long distances were desirous of making further remarks, or giving the result of their own experience, in the arduous work of Sunday School instruction; but the train was due, the whistle was heard afar off, and there was no choice between immediate departure by rail and a walk back to Manchester four miles in wind

and rain. So with kind farewells and friendly pressures of the hand the great company separated—many of them perhaps to meet no more in the present state, but numbers, I hope, the better for thus coming together, departing with new hopes and pleasant anticipations, with more earnest aims for duty, with desires strengthened by the associations of the day, for the spiritual improvement of their brethren of mankind, especially of those to whom the Gospel was first preached,—the poor, those who may be perishing from the lack of knowledge.

And this leads me to observe, which I do with the sincerest pleasure, that the meetings were religious in the best sense of the word. Beautifully did the preacher of the day depict the self-sacrificing spirit of the Lord Jesus, and earnest were his calls on his hearers to aim at resemblance to him who gave himself up for our sakes. Though secular instruction on the Lord's day was not formally repudiated by any of the speakers save myself, it was evidently regarded as a thing to be but barely tolerated, and as in no way desirable for its own sake. I ventured to mention the success which we think attends the Irish plan of confining Sunday School teaching to religion alone, and was heard with great attention, whilst many appeared to think it might work well in England. To this opinion I trust and believe we shall all come at last.

I will only add, that in a survey of the Lower Moseley Street Sunday School on the following Sunday afternoon—the time was unfavourable, as it was Easter Sunday and a general holiday—I was much struck with the order and regularity of the classes, and with the attention of the teachers. The superintendents of both the male and female Schools are the teachers of the Week-day Schools, who come voluntarily on the Sunday from pure love of the work, and from no outward pressure. They appear every way qualified for the office. It must not be forgotten that English Sunday Schools open at nine in the morning all the year round. One of the lady teachers in this School walks nearly three miles every Sunday morning to be present at the commencement.

Respectfully submitting the above to your kind consideration, I am, yours in all Christian fellowship,

THOMAS BOWRING.

BELFAST, *April* 21, 1865.

LIBRRARY OF THE UNITARIAN CONGREGATION, ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Last month you were kind enough to insert in your magazine a letter addressed to me by the Rev. J. C. Wood, minister of the Unitarian Congregation of Adelaide, South Australia, soliciting donations of books towards the formation of a congregational library which he and his people are engaged in establishing, together with a note from myself, stating that I would receive and forward any books, or parcels of books, that might be addressed to me for that purpose. I now beg to

acknowledge the receipt of a parcel of books from Mrs Gibon, of Ballymena; of another from Mr. James Patrick, of Ballymena; and of a third from the Rev. James Callwell, of Glenarm,—all of them containing works well suited to the end in view. Permit me to state that I shall keep my parcel open for the reception of additional contributions till Monday, the 15th of May, on which day it must be despatched without farther delay; and I hope that any friends who are desirous of helping forward this useful undertaking, and who may have duplicate copies, or copies which they can spare, of books fit for a congregational library, will transmit them to me in the meantime, that they may be forwarded at once, along with the donations already received, and some volumes which I have selected from my own book-shelves. I hope to receive several contributions in reply to this notification. Donors will save me some trouble if, along with each parcel, a list of the works included in it be transmitted. With regard to the selection of books, it appears to me that while works in illustration and defence of the distinguishing tenets held by Christian Unitarians, and on the subject of religion in general, are, of course, peculiarly desirable, it is by no means necessary to confine the choice to books of that class; on the contrary, works on history, biography, science, and standard literature, would, I conceive, be very acceptable.—I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir, yours very truly,

J. Scott Porter.

Belfast, 26*th April*, 1865.

INTELLIGENCE.

MANCHESTER DISTRICT SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

On Good Friday, April 14, the annual meeting of this Association was held at Monton, near Manchester. A very large number of teachers and friends of Sunday Schools from all parts of the district were gathered together. At half-past ten o'clock, service was conducted in the chapel by the Rev. James Drummond, B.A. The building was crowded in every part, many being compelled to stand in the aisles and porch, and more than 100 being unable to obtain admittance. Taking his text from John xii. 24, Mr. Drummond preached a sermon most appropriate to the occasion. After the service was concluded, the assembly adjourned to the new and spacious school-rooms adjoining the chapel, where an excellent dinner, according to custom, was provided. Above 500 persons partook of the dinner, the arrangements for which were so admirably made that, while everyone was amply accommodated, there was no confusion. The usual business meeting was held in the chapel at two o'clock, and was unusually well attended. Among the gentlemen present at this and the evening meeting were the following ministers:—Revs. Dr. Beard, J. Drummond, B.A.; R. Pilcher, B.A.; J. Wright, B.A.; Brooke Herford, S. Robinson, A. Gordon, M.A.; T. E. Poynting, J. Cropper, M.A.; J. Taylor,

J. Fox, B. Glover, George Fox, J. Freeston, W. Hargrave, B.A., J. Ellis, T. Jones, and A. Rushton. The Rev. T. Bowring and Mr. I. M. Wade were present, the former as a deputation from the Northern Sunday School Association, and the latter from the London Sunday School Society. In the absence of the president, the chair was taken by the Rev. John Wright. Mr. J. Pilcher read the reports of the Committee and of the Visitor, and also the Treasurer's statement of accounts. After resolutions had been passed, adopting the reports, thanking the retiring officers, and electing a new committee,

Mr. JOHN DENDY moved—"That this meeting offers a cordial welcome to I. M. Wade, Esq., attending as a deputation from the Sunday School Association of London, and to the Rev. Thomas Bowring, who attends as a deputation from the Irish Northern Sunday School Association." They had spoken of their association merely as uniting the schools of a given district together, but it had a broader work. One of its good effects was that it united schools at a distance in sympathy. On the present occasion they had the pleasure of seeing their old friend Mr. Wade, whom the meeting would gladly welcome, and also the Rev. T. Bowring, from Belfast. To the latter he would say, that in their association they recognised no distinction of old or new school, and made no inquiries into particular forms of belief. They would be glad to see more representatives of associations, the opening out of a wider bond of union. It was unfortunate that they as Unitarians had no organisation; but they must make the best of what they had; and he hoped this association would tend to unite their brethren, whether in England, Ireland, or Scotland.

Dr. MARCUS seconded the resolution, and referred to Mr. Wade and Mr. Bowring in cordial terms.

Mr. I. M. WADE, who was received with cheers, said he had been so often the recipient of their kindness that even this, the kindest welcome of all, did not overwhelm him. They were not in the habit of having such meetings in London; nor did they bring the same heart, strength, and goodwill when they came. Therefore, it was deeply gratifying to find himself among such a large body of zealous workers. The reason why associations should meet and take notes was to compare each other's plans and progress. How else were they to perfect their work? If teachers had their work, how much more must this association have in collecting the statistics of every school and maintaining the bond of union? He was more thankful than surprised that the northern schools had not suffered more through their great ordeal than they had. There was no ground for despair, but for encouragement. He regretted there should be any doubt that a visitor could be of use, and that the office was of little service. Such a doubt was to him a standing puzzle. Year by year he had told his London friends that all had been working well, a capital visitor being engaged who was doing much good in learning the condition of the schools. He referred to the Belfast Book Society, from whence cheap books could be obtained. In regard to the debt of £90, he should say that the London Association owed more than that. Let the Manchester Association be thankful they owed no more.

The Rev. T. Bowring returned thanks for his kindly welcome. The Irish schools wished to cultivate the kindliest feelings toward their English brethren. He gave some interesting particulars in regard to the Irish School Association and the schools themselves. The schools were different from those in England, and he liked the Irish plan of conducting them better. He did so because in the Irish schools the instruction was wholly religious. The Bible was the general text-book. He thought there was now no need of secular instruction in our Sunday schools, and in his experience, the results of secular instruction there had not been favourable to chapel-going. The more instruction was religious, the more would good be done. Boys and girls met in the same room with good effect. Having eulogised the sermon of Mr. Drummond, and spoken in relation to the Belfast Book Society, where the New Testament could be had for twopence, he again thanked the meeting for their cordial reception of him.

Mr. J. Harland moved the following resolution :—"That the warmest thanks of this meeting be given to the Rev. James Drummond, B.A., for his services of this morning." It was seconded by Mr. Nanson, and unanimously carried.

The Rev. J. Drummond, B.A., briefly returned thanks.

After tea, the company assembled in the large room of the Monton School room. John Dendy, Esq., B.A., presided, and the meeting was addressed by Revs. J. Freeston, Brooke Herford, T. Bowring, and Messrs. Pilcher, Carling, Broadbent, &c.

DOMESTIC MISSION TO THE POOR OF BELFAST.

On Monday evening, April 3rd, the annual meeting of the friends and supporters of this Mission was held in the Mission Rooms, Stanhope Street. In the absence of the Rev. W. Bruce, the President of the Society, the Rev. J. S. Porter was moved to the chair, and the meeting having been opened with prayer by the Rev. T. Bowring, the chairman said that, though they all regretted the absence of the President, his absence allowed him an opportunity of bearing testimony, which he should have been reluctant to do in his presence, to the increasing zeal that he devotes to the work of this Christian Mission. In that establishment Mr. Bruce took a warm and lively interest; he gave to it the benefit of his established character, his well-known judgment, and the commanding influence which he exercises over the whole of their Christian denomination. He had been as punctual in his attendance at the meetings of Committee as he was in discharging the duties of his pulpit, and the Society had received much benefit from his attention and counsel in the management of its affairs. They would now hear the reports read from the General Committee and from the Treasurer, and also a report from their worthy, respected, and venerated Missionary. It had been one of the best circumstances connected with that Mission since it began that they formed a connexion with Mr. Bowring, who, when in health, and even when not in health, had been most energetic and active in his duties. He had been most earnest, and, he believed, most successful, in opposing those vices with which all Christian ministers have to con-

tend, but found more especially in the province of one whose ministry is directed to the humble and neglected classes of our community. It seemed as if there were two nations dwelling together in the same city. They would find the good, they would find the enlightened and the religious, and he was happy to believe that these were as fully developed as at any former period; but, alas! they would also find in close proximity those who seemed lost to all elevating influences; they would find those who had grown up in neglect of religious observances, and too frequently in the neglect of those moral duties which religious observances are calculated to promote. It is to the latter class Mr. Bowring has been called to direct his energies, and, having been in some degree acquainted with a few of those who have attended on his ministry, and knowing the esteem and regard with which he is looked on by those who have benefited by his labours, he must say he had been most successful in contending with those arduous difficulties which met him in every step of his progress. During the recent riots which disgraced our town, and made us a scandal in almost the whole civilised world, although the poor connected with this Mission were subjected to trials, and were liable to be carried away by their folly and their passions, yet none of them had been brought to the tribunal of justice in connexion with those lamentable occurrences. The lessons inculcated in their schools had sunk into the hearts of the poor and the destitute, and he believed future generations would receive in a great measure the benefit of the instruction imparted in these schools.

James M. Darbishire, Esq., then read the Report, from which we give the following extracts:—

"Your Committee feel deeply grateful to the Father of Mercies for the large measure of success which has attended their past labours in the cause of humanity and benevolence. They look forward to the future welfare of the Charity with well-grounded hope and confidence, feeling satisfied that its various departments are based on sound and solid foundations.

"Your Committee refer with heartfelt satisfaction to the energy and perseverance manifested by your excellent Missionary in developing the various resources of the Mission; and although he has to encounter many difficulties, and has been subjected to almost daily annoyances and disappointments in the discharge of his duties, he has never wearied in 'well-doing,' but through 'good report' and through 'evil report,' he has pursued the path of duty hopefully and steadily, mindful only of the importance of the work he has undertaken—the moral, social, and physical improvement of the poor and destitute around him. Your Committee earnestly pray that Mr. Bowring may be spared for many years to carry on the good work in which his heart is so warmly interested, and the duties of which he so fully comprehends. They trust that each succeeding year may more fully convince him that his labours are not in vain to those on whom they are so freely and so constantly bestowed.

"Your Committee have to report that the new Mission premises in Stanhope Street were completed and entered on early in May last, at which period Mr. Bowring occupied the house intended for

the Missionary's residence, and the Mission Station was fitted up for all the purposes for which it was designed.

"Your Committee have the satisfaction further to report, that all the liabilities connected with the erection and furnishing of the Mission premises have been discharged, and that they have every reason to be satisfied with the manner in which the work has been executed.

"Since the last Annual Meeting a change has been made in the management of the Day and Evening Schools. These Schools, which were originally in connexion with the Mission, are now under the exclusive patronage of Valentine Whitla, Esq., who, in the most handsome manner, has expressed a desire that in future all the expenses connected with them shall be defrayed by himself. When making this notification to your Committee, Mr. Whitla kindly intimated that he should at all times be happy to allow his school buildings to be made available for the purposes of the Mission. Conformably with this generous intimation, the Sunday Schools connected with the Mission continue to assemble as heretofore in the School Room belonging to Mr. Whitla.

"Your Committee feel very grateful to Mr. Whitla for the advantages they have so long enjoyed, and still continue to enjoy, from the Schools, with respect to the children of the families belonging to the Mission, and they trust they may ever be found ready, either personally or through their Missionary, to afford any assistance either in correspondence with the National Board or in the management of the Schools which Mr. Whitla may desire.

"The Sunday and Week-day services, conducted by Mr. Bowring in the Mission Church, have been attended by regular and attentive hearers, to whom your Committee have every reason to believe Mr. Bowring's mode of expounding the Sacred Scriptures has always proved attractive and improving.

"Your Committee trust, now that a suitable and commodious building has been erected for the worship of Almighty God, many who have not hitherto been accustomed to 'assemble themselves together' may be induced to do so, and to join with heart and voice in praise to One God, the Father, and to Jesus Christ his well-beloved Son, the only Mediator between God and man, while at the same time a bond of union may be formed between minister and hearers, which in coming years may be productive of mutual comfort and satisfaction."

Mr. Darbishire also read the Report of the Ladies' General Committee, which, after referring to the Clothing Society and the Provident Fund, adds:—

"The Female Mission, or Missing-Link Agency, has been conducted during the year in accordance with the rules originally drawn up for its management. The ladies who superintend it more especially have every reason to believe that its usefulness as a subordinate part of the Domestic Mission remains undiminished. Their Biblewoman continues to pursue her various duties conscientiously, and has proved herself to be zealous in their discharge. To these duties has been added that of conducting a sewing class in her house, for young women belonging to the Mission, this class

being managed on the same principles as the Mothers' Meeting held in the preceding year, but which latter could not be resumed under the personal superintendence of the Ladies, on account of circumstances over which they had no control. The sewing class has been held in the winter months once every week, the attendance being regular, and averaging about eleven. Small pieces of old and new carpeting having been sent in by friends of the Mission, several excellent warm quilts have been made in her spare hours by Mrs. Moncrieff, and these have been greatly sought after, at the price put on them by the Committee. In her journal she writes, that 'the sick have been her especial care, and that the food she has been enabled to prepare for them has helped some to return to their work.' The baby-linen loan bags have been of much benefit, and no difficulty has yet occurred in getting them back in good order; and the old linen supplied to her has been of great use among the poor; also material for patches, which she has shewn them how to use."

The Rev. THOMAS BOWRING then gave a detailed and interesting report of his labours during the year. We regret that we have not space to publish it in full, but we subjoin lengthened extracts.

"It may be interesting to know that in the past twelve months I have made nearly three thousand calls. Yet I would remark, that I do not measure my labours by any specified amount of visits, for such a test would be most fallacious. One case might take up the greater part of a day, and yet be of more value than ten ordinary ones, whilst in the enumeration it would count but singly. Still, my friends may like to know that my time is thus occupied in their service. I have said that the past year has been eventful. In some respects we must all acknowledge it to have been sadly so. The terrible scenes of last August must long be imprinted on the recollection, when, in words as if made for the occasion—

> "'Windows were broken down in every street,
> And men, for fear, compelled to shut their shops.'

In common with all classes of the Belfast community, our poor people suffered greatly during the riots. Most of them suffered more mentally than from injury to their persons or houses; but they were in continued expectation of 'wrecking'; could not, for fear, work by day nor sleep at night; were worn out by repeated watchings, and were full of alarms and forebodings on account of themselves and their friends. In house after house that I visited I heard but one story,—'We dared not go to bed for a week, for ten nights, together, or if we retired, we could not sleep. Every moment we thought the mobs were coming upon us.' I find remarks to this effect in my diary from August 17th to 20th—'These days present a weary blank. I judged it best to be about the Mission premises as much as possible, for we knew not what an hour might bring forth. Most thankful and devoutly grateful are we for a return of tranquillity, as we could scarcely eat or sleep during the time of agitation; but God has given us this rest. I am happy to report that none of our people, to my knowledge, have received outward damage, nor have any been at

all implicated in these fearful tumults. 'You have always preached peace to us, and told us we should love all our neighbours,' said one of my hearers to me, and I humbly trust that so far my labours have not been in vain.' Again, on Sunday, August 21st—'The School was but thinly attended to-day. This we anticipated. I was glad and greatly relived at finding several of the scholars there for whom I had felt very anxious, as they were growing lads, much, of necessity, about the streets, peculiarly excitable and impressible on occasions such as the past week presented, and a few of whom might have been forced to join a riotous mob; but not one had done so, or, as I learned, had thrown a stone or done any unlawful act. It was thought expedient to have no second school or service for the rest of the day. But at the morning service, at which several adults were present, I made some brief remarks from the 91st Psalm, on Divine mercy in our preservation, and on the necessity of observing peace, law, order, and charity, for the rest of our days.'"

"But dismissing this most painful subject, which we should be all glad, if possible, to bury in the deepest oblivion, I turn with satisfaction to the legitimate operations of the Mission for the past year, which, as I hope, will prove to the Subscribers that something has been done—something is still doing—for the great cause we all have at heart. The new Mission premises were opened for public worship and other religious purposes on Sunday, 15th May last, and both the Sunday and week night services are well attended, the house being at times quite filled. On Sunday, Sept. 18th, the Communion of the Lord's Supper was held in the Mission-room; the evening was chosen for the purpose, as more likely to ensure an attendance such as could be desired. I had previously preached from Luke xxii. 19—'Do this in remembrance of me.' The evening proved wet, yet a good number were present; every person stayed to witness, and by far the majority communicated; the greatest, nay, the most reverential silence prevailed throughout, and all appeared to be deeply interested. We propose to have these celebrations half-yearly, and the effects will, we humbly hope, prove every way beneficial. The weather, I must again remind you, materially influences such a Congregation as ours. Cold and wet thin the attendance; for, alas! the clothes are thread-bare, the shoes let in water. Here a man has only his well-worn working coat, or a woman has no bonnet or shawl; and here, again, pride, it may be honest pride, prevents appearance among what is called decent people. Yet, with all deductions arising from such various causes, we have, I think, abundant reason to be satisfied with affairs as they are. They are susceptible of improvement—of vast improvement; but we will not despise the day of small things, and we will trust where we cannot clearly see; we will continue to hope that more good is doing than we are now permitted to know.

"You will, however, like to hear a little in detail of what I, your agent, have done, or perhaps should say, have tried to do, since I had the pleasure of addressing you. I have long called, statedly, on a poor man whose legs are paralyzed, and who, consequently, has lost entirely the power of locomotion. His wife, he says, carries him up stairs at night on her back. He contrives to shuffle

down stairs by himself in the morning; and, being placed in a chair by the fire, he is compelled to sit in it, with no power to rise. Thus day by day, and even year by year, he spends a most monotonous and, I fear, cheerless existence, because he is very ignorant, and but few inspiring thoughts can pass through his mind. Kind friends have, from time to time, given him articles of warm clothing; for it may well be supposed his blood is chilled from want of due circulation. His wife is compelled to leave him many hours in the day, to attend the markets, and to carry the produce from door to door. There are two children, both attending our schools,—the eldest a girl, very shrewd; but they are too young to do much for the parents. The man is always greatly pleased at my calls, whilst I make a point of engaging his attention on portions of Scripture fitted, as I conceive, to inform and to console. This case may have little of novelty in it, but it is one in which I feel much interest. It is peculiarly within the scope of a Domestic Mission; for we are to lift up the hands which hang down, and to speak peace to him who is heavy of heart. I am sorry to observe, further, that the paralysis seems extending to the hands. He lamented to me very lately that he could no longer shave himself, his beard being then of a fortnight's growth.

"So full are all Domestic Mission Reports of the debasing and destroying effects of drunkenness, that there is a just fear our friends will sicken at the name and be apt to pass over all records of the kind with loathing. They cannot be more averse to read the recital than we are to make it, and yet to do it is a necessity. I have, and so has Mrs. Moncrieff, frequently visited a family where all is commonly in the utmost confusion. The mother, some time since, was compelled to work in a brickyard at one of the hardest of our out-door employments, along with one of her sons, to help to support the family; latterly, she had been more at home. The man drinks, and the small wages he earns as a carter are in good part dribbled away for the liquid fire. Not long ago he lost, under the influence of liquor, a sum belonging to his master—to the family a serious item. The money had to be made good by weekly stoppages from his wages. It must be believed that whilst the mother was away at the brickyard, the house and the children were in a terrible state. All was dirt, with confusion and riot. Her return has made improvement, still there is much to amend and very much to lament.

"The Sunday-school connected with the Mission is coeval with the institution itself, and must be ever regarded as one of its most valuable adjuncts. In point of numbers we have an increase, though not to any great extent, whilst many of the older scholars remain with us, a fact which gives us all pleasure to record. We trust they will long continue. Of the teachers who, Sunday after Sunday, are found in their places, I cannot speak too highly; but indeed they have a heavy burden to bear. Too much, I hesitate not to say, is thrown on them; the labourers are too few for the harvest. We want an increase here, and especially of gentlemen. We want to see some more of the well-educated and well-disposed of the young men of the Belfast Unitarian Congregations come forward to help on the good work."

M. Andrews, Esq, read the Treasurer's statement of accounts, and a series of resolutions, adopting the Reports, declaring the importance of the Institution, and the duty of efficiently maintaining it; conveying the thanks of the meeting to Mr. Bowring and to the Ladies' Committee and the Managing Committee, were moved and seconded by the Rev. C. J. M'Alester and T. B. Johnson, J. M'Cloy, A. O'D. Taylor, H. Darbishire, W. H. Greer, and T. A. Hill, Esqrs., and Dr. Brice Smyth, and were unanimously passed. Mr. Johnson was moved to the second chair, when the thanks of the meeting were conveyed to Mr. Porter, and the proceedings were terminated with singing and prayer.

Lecture at Ballyclare.—On Monday, the 19th April, the Rev. Francis M'Cammon, of Springvale, delivered a lecture at Ballyclare to a numerous audience, collected in the large and commodious lecture-hall of the Messrs. Archer, of Milltown, kindly granted for the purpose. James A. Wiley, Esq., of Drumadarragh, occupied the chair. The title of the lecture was—"A Tour on the Continent," and Mr. M'Cammon undertook to deliver it for the combined purpose of entertaining the public, and raising funds for the Sunday-school in connexion with the Northern Presbyterian (Unitarian) Congregation of Ballyclare. The lecturer gave an interesting report of his travels, continued for about two years, through various countries of Europe. Much information was imparted respecting the countries themselves, and the customs and character of their inhabitants; and various anecdotes told respecting what had happened to the lecturer himself, and likewise to others, rendered the discourse interesting and attractive. Well-deserved votes of thanks were passed to Mr. M'Cammon for his instructive lecture, to the Messrs. Archer for the use of their lecture-room, and to the chairman for his kindness in presiding.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Huntly, Banbridge, on March 14th, Miss Dunbar, aged 87 years. The removal of this good and generous woman, even at so advanced an age, has left a melancholy blank in the extensive circle to which she was known, and has caused unusual sorrow in the neighbourhood in which she lived. She was distinguished by remarkable clearness of judgment, great energy of character, and unbounded generosity. Her life was in every respect exemplary, and the respect in which she was held was strikingly exhibited by the vast concourse of persons of all ranks and denominations that attended her funeral, and by the closing of all the shops in Banbridge on the day of her interment.

Died, on April 24th, at the residence of his aunt, Mrs. Simpson, Cogry, Robert W. Simpson, Esq., of Ballyclare.

Died at Newry, on April 8th, Mary, widow of the late Rev. John Mitchel, aged 79 years.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] JUNE, 1865. [No. 5.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL UNITARIAN CONVENTION.

WE give, in our Intelligence department, a condensed report of the important convention of American Unitarians recently held in New York. The proceedings will, from various causes, be regarded with much interest by members of the denomination in these countries.

So large an assemblage of ministers and lay delegates indicates the progress which Unitarian principles have made in the United States; but the meeting was more important than its mere numbers would have rendered it, for it represented, in a remarkable degree, the moral and intellectual culture, the social refinement, and the professional importance of the New England and other Northern States; and proved that, among the thinking and educated classes, our rational principles of Christian truth have been widely embraced.

This Convention also exhibits the spiritual life which animates the American Unitarian Church. It might have been supposed that the calamitous war, in which the people of the United States have been for several years engaged,—the bereavements that must have fallen on so many homes, from the fearful carnage which marked the war,—and the diminution of means which military expenses and the disturbance of business relations must have brought on the people generally,—would have disheartened and crippled them, so as to have prevented them from entering on schemes for the extension of their religious principles; but, on the contrary, we find them, during the war, seeking to disseminate, wherever the Federal armies went, books and tracts calculated to explain and enforce the Unitarian doctrine, and to impart to those who were exposed to trial and peril, those religious views that were

so well fitted to influence their life, and to cheer and comfort them; while to the suffering and the dying in the hospitals, they freely distributed such volumes as Eliot's "Discipline of Sorrow," and Ware's "Silent Pastor;" and now, when the approaching termination of the war gives them a prospect of making their religion more widely known, they lose no time in laying their plans and providing funds; with a zeal, a generosity, and a prudence, that are worthy of all admiration, they devise means for training additional preachers, and for sowing their tracts broadcast on the whole country to which they may have access. Whatever lack of energy and life there may be in the Unitarian Church elsewhere, there is no want of them there.

The report which was submitted at the Convention from the Meadville College is deserving of notice. Established by the Unitarians, it is yet perfectly free, and the only doctrinal test required from those who seek admission to it is *a belief in the divine origin of Christianity*. To some in America, as well as in these countries, even that condition would be objected to as a creed; but it is hard to understand how any should seek admission to Christian pulpits who do not accept the very foundation principle of Christ's church; and it is interesting to know that this important institution does not profess "*absolute* religious liberty," but places the Divine origin of Christianity as its *fundamental principle*. What a striking contrast this simple and essentially Christian basis forms to that of a new College about to be opened in connexion with one of the leading Protestant denominations in this country, in which it is provided that not only the members of the Theological Faculty, but all the Professors—even the Professor of "Calisthenics and Deportment," (which a learned Doctor of Divinity thought they should have)—must sign the Westminster Confession of Faith!

Aid is afforded in the Meadville College to students whose circumstances require it, to the amount of one hundred and twenty dollars a year, and tuition and the use of the library are free. Thus young persons of ability and piety are encouraged to enter its classes, and prepare themselves for the Christian ministry. At any time such inducements would have been right; they are particularly

important now, when other professions and occupations afford so much greater promise of worldly success. Some years ago, when a similar mode of encouragement to young men of promise was proposed in our Non-Subscribing Association, certain members strongly objected, and argued that it was opposed to sound principles of political economy! It works well, however, in Meadville, and not badly, we believe, in Manchester College, and in the Home Missionary Board in England.

It soon became apparent in the Convention, that there were two distinct parties, representing what are well known in these countries as the Old School and the New School: predictions, indeed, were made before the meetings commenced, that there would only be discord and strife. Happily these anticipations were not fulfilled; the proceedings were conducted in a calm and Christian spirit: no rude personal attacks were made, and no foul imputations were thrown out by any of the speakers against those who could not embrace their more "advanced" opinions. One person, a Mr. Burleigh, spoke most irreverently of our Lord, alleging that the term "Lord," as applied to him, merely signified "Mister," and that he was called in the Scriptures *Mr. Jesus Christ,* but such profanity was instantly silenced; the speaker was called to order; and we are glad to learn that he did not belong to the Unitarian denomination at all.

An effort was made by a few of the members to get rid of the name "Unitarian," and to assume the designation of "Free Christian," or some similar title; but the strong Unitarian sentiment of the ministers, and still more, we are pleased to know, of the lay delegates, resisted such an attempt, and the Convention, by a decided vote, declared themselves Unitarian Christians. In the earlier part of the proceedings, one of the lay members offered a resolution, embodying, as the doctrines of the Convention, the leading articles of the Apostles' Creed. This proposal sprung from the reasonable apprehension that the Convention might be led to sink Christian principles, in order not to displease the Parkerite School: but a minute statement of opinion is not fitted to be the basis of a church organization; it seems to be falling into the very error which has enslaved or rent asunder so many

churches, and it was not adopted; but several of the leading ministers, Dr. Bellows, Dr. Gannett, and Mr. Putnam, enunciated very distinctly the Christian basis on which they sought to rest their organization; and the constitution agreed on acknowledges the Lord Jesus Christ.

We cannot, however, refrain from expressing our disappointment, that there was not something more decidedly affirming the Divine authority of Revelation. We know the desire which exists to prevent strife, and secure co-operation; but between two principles so discordant as scepticism and belief—Deism and Christianity—there can be no real or abiding union; and that which is now one organization, must in a little time separate and become two or more distinct denominations. If the Unitarian Church in America be diminished by the secession of those who have adopted rationalistic views, it may, on the other hand, be largely increased by a union with two other important Churches, essentially Unitarian in their doctrines—the Universalists and the Christians—and be, under God, instrumental in bringing into the fold of Christ the millions spread over the Northern, Southern, and Western States, who, knowing no form of Christian faith but Popery or Calvinism, have abandoned religion and sunk into unbelief.

THE LAST SLEEP.

"The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him."

When, like a shade from Summer's sky,
The darkness of this life shall cease—
When the unconscious breast shall lie
In the still earth's funereal peace:—
How will the sleeper rest in dust,
His clay with kindred clay be blent;
While the free spirit of the just,
Soars to a brighter element!

There is a tranquilizing thought
Commingled with the voiceless grave;
'Tis with no bitter memories fraught—
It echoes not to Time's dull wave;
Passion and Pride are passed away,
As the deep slumberer sinks to rest,
Like gilded clouds, when sunset's ray
Is fading from the unbounded west.

And the hot gusts of kindling wrath,
That lashed the bosom into storm—
They darken not that slumberer's path,
And the knit brow no more deform.
The throbbing heart is calm and hushed,
The pulse of Hate is cold and still;
And hopes, by sin and sorrow crushed,
Rise not to vex the baffled will!

Thus should it be! He slumbers now,
Sweet as the cradled infant's rest;
No shadows cross that settled brow,
On which the unfelt clod is pressed!
From the sealed lid there steals no tear;
There is no care the eye to dim;
And in his shroud reposing there,
The vale's dull clod "is sweet to him."

Oh, who would wake the sleeper up,
To walk earth's gloomy round again:
To feel the drops from sorrow's cup
Rise to the hot and fevered brain?
Far rather, in their lonely bed,
Let his still ashes moulder on;
Since the free spirit is not dead,
But to an endless life is gone!

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.*

(*Continued from p.* 122.)

Between Mr. Adair's arrest and "free confinement in Lord Masserene's house," on account of Colonel Blood's Plot in 1663, and his transportation to Belfast in 1674, there are few events to record, in connexion either with himself or his Congregation of Cairncastle. On July 4, 1671, being the earliest date in the extant Minutes of the "Antrim Meeting," his name appears as Moderator of the brethren; and towards the close of the same year, he was appointed by his associates to go to Dublin "to preach there in Mr. Jaques's Congregation (Bull-alley), and to study a healing of quarrel in that Congregation." During Mr. Adair's absence on this difficult and delicate mission, Mr. Thomas Hall of Larne was chosen to fill the Moderator's chair, and the pulpit of Cairncastle was ordered to be supplied by certain neighbouring brethren, which was done. Mr. Adair appears to have returned from Dublin about Christmas, in 1671, but as in those days a journey from the North of Ireland to the metropolis was a serious matter, we are not surprised to read that at the meeting of the brethren in January, 1672, Mr. Adair was not present, and that his "absence was excused, being unwell after his travels." He was appointed, however, "when his health permitted," to undertake the less arduous journey of going to the neighbouring parish of Glenarm, "and preaching there on a week-day, and seeing what duty the people there did to Mr. Anderson their minister." He was also enjoined, about this time, in conjunction with his neighbour, Mr. Hall of Larne, "to use diligence about the history of Ireland, and to send his collections to Mr. Drysdale the writer of that history;" which he subse-

* I have to correct an error into which I inadvertently fell in my last month's paper. I therein stated that the Cairncastle meeting-house was built on the Ballygally estate, and that its site was probably the gift of the Shaw family to their fellow-Presbyterians of the parish. I now find that it is situated in the townland of Corkermain, which in early times was held in fee under the Earls of Antrim by a family called Tullis, which passed by female heiresses to the M'Culloch and Crowe families successively, which was sold by the latter, about fifty years ago, to the late Mr. E. J. Agnew of Kilwaughter, and continues to the present day a part of the Kilwaughter estate.

sequently undertook to do; but his own manuscript history—which continues in manuscript to the present day—was, I believe, the only result of this movement.

On March 27, 1672, it is recorded that "Mr. David Cunningham was ordained at Cairncastle for Connor, after sermon on Israel lviii., and prayer by Mr. P. Adair."

In 1673, Mr. Adair was requested by the brethren of the "Laggan Meeting"—a district in the N.W. of Ulster,—to go to Dublin a second time, on the business of the Bull-alley Congregation, but on this occasion, remembering, I presume, the ill success and disagreeable results of his former mission, he declined complying with the wishes of his brethren; and the schism in the Dublin Congregation was soon afterwards healed by the removal thereto of Mr. Keyes of Belfast, which prepared the way for Mr. Adair's own succession to the charge which Mr. Keyes thus vacated. This latter transportation may have been further promoted by an appointment which, about this time Mr. Adair received from "the meeting," and the fulfilment of which would bring him into close contact with the people of Belfast. Lady Donegall appears to have been much displeased by the removal of Mr. Keyes from Belfast to Dublin, and "the meeting appointed a letter to be written by Mr. Adair to Mr. Bryan (apparently the agent of the Donegall family), anent that business, and to study to give them satisfaction." At next meeting in June, 1673, it is stated that "Master Patrick Adair observed the meeting's appointment in writing to Mr. Bryan;" but the correspondence does not seem to have had at first the intended soothing effect, for the displeasure of the Donegall family at the loss of their minister (Mr. Keyes) was so inveterate, that for a considerable time they would not allow the people of Belfast to take any steps towards the appointment of a successor. At this period, there are various entries referring to the difficulty which the meeting had in procuring from Lord and Lady Donegall "liberty for the people of Belfast to choose their own minister;" and it was not until the month of April, 1674, that "two Commissioners appeared from Belfast, signifying that some of their number were with my Lord Donegall, from whom they had a favourable answer." These Commissioners, at the same time,

further represented to the meeting that the Belfast congregation "had fixed their eyes on Mr. Patrick Adair, and that they were appointed to come to the meeting for advice in that affair."

But before detailing the particulars of Mr. Adair's removal from Cairncastle to Belfast, which was not so easily accomplished as are similar removals in the present day, I may mention some facts which are recorded at this time with respect to the Cairncastle congregation, and which, perhaps, hastened Mr. Adair's transportation therefrom. In February, 1674, the meeting appointed "an account to be taken of the Parish of Cairncastle," by Mr. Anderson of Glenarm, who reported at the next meeting in March, that he had gone thither according to appointment, "but the people not being ripe, another diet was appointed which Mr. Anderson was not able to keep; only Mr. Anderson finds that people considerably in arrear with their minister, almost a whole year's means, and near a third part of several years preceding." At the meeting of April 7, 1674, the statement made with respect to this congregation was even worse than the foregoing. "Anent Cairncastle report is made by Mr. Anderson that that people are considerably in arrear for every year of four concluding at All Saints, 1672; and the year commencing from that and concluding at All Saints, 1673, is not yet applotted, and no mention of the year current. The meeting renews the appointment upon Mr. Anderson, who is desired yet to travail with that people, and endeavour to stir them up to duty, and withal signify to them that we expect a better account next meeting." At the next meeting the first step (as we have seen) was taken by the people of Belfast towards relieving Mr. Adair from his embarrassments in Cairncastle, by procuring his transportation to *them;* but the removal, simple as it would appear to be in the present day, was not by any means so easy of accomplishment in the times of which we write. The measure was deliberated on for six months by the ministers of the Antrim meeting. The advice in the matter of the brethren of all the other "meetings" was asked and obtained; nor was the point finally settled without special "prayer to God for direction." Under these circumstances I may, perhaps, be

excused for giving somewhat at length the record of this singular case of old-fashioned Presbyterian discipline.

"Ballyclare, *April* 21, 1674.—Appear two Commissioners from Belfast, signifying that that congregation have fixed their eyes on Mr. Patrick Adair, and that they were appointed to come to the meeting for advice in that affair. The meeting, considering difficulties that appear in the way of that business, answer that their present straightness will not permit them to take it to their consideration at this time, and therefore the brethren only laid before these Commissioners the difficulties that appear in the way of that affair, and refer it to their more serious consideration.

"Ballyclare, *May* 26, 1674.—From Belfast appear William Moore and Alexander Arthur, signifying to the meeting that although they have not as yet a call in readiness for Mr. Adair, yet they have not laid that business aside.

"Ballyclare, *July* 7, 1674.—Mr. Robert Kelso (Raloo) and the Clerk (Robert Henry of Carrickfergus), according to appointment supplied Belfast, from whence several persons commissioned have come and brought a call to Mr. P. Adair to serve in the ministry among them, with a supplication to the meeting to transport Mr. Adair from Cairncastle, his present charge, unto them, and to deal with Mr. Adair to accept their call, with divers reasons pressing their desire. The brethren being as yet unclear what may be their duty in this weighty affair, in order to attaining a resolution therein do appoint the people of Cairncastle to come and appear at the next diet of meeting at this place to defend their present interest in Mr. Adair, and give in what reasons they may have against the said transportation; and the people of Belfast are appointed speedily to transmit this appointment to the meeting for Cairncastle's appearing as aforesaid, together with the reasons they have exhibited to the meeting to enforce their desire; that so Cairncastle may have opportunity of answering the same. Withal Mr. Adair being inquired what his thoughts are of this call and desire of Belfast, and he declaring himself unclear to be loosed from Cairncastle, is enjoined to wait on the next meeting, time and place aforesaid, and to give in his reasons against the aforesaid desire of Belfast.

"Ballyclare, *August* 4, 1674.—The people of Belfast appearing in pursuance of their call to Mr. Adair given in to the last meeting, the people of Cairncastle were called and did appear and give in their reasons against the transportation of Mr. Adair, and shew answers to the reasons of Belfast for the transportation. Mr. Adair also was called, and his mind required, with his reasons anent the said call. All which, after hearing, were seriously considered, and at length debated, the result whereof was that the advice of the rest of the meetings should be written for, and for that end this meeting appoints the Clerk to despatch a condescended upon draft of a letter to the several meetings, together with a true copy of the papers of Belfast, Cairncastle, and Mr. Adair, and this result was intimated to all parties concerned, and they required to attend next meeting.

"Ballyclare, *Sept.* 1*st*, 1674.—Anent the business of Mr. Adair his transportation to Belfast, the Clerk having written to all the

meetings save Laggan, according to appointment, returns came from the meetings of Down and Route, with correspondents; from Down, that they were unanimously clear *for* the said transportation,—from Route, from what they have yet heard that they were for the *negative*. No account hath come from Laggan or Tyrone in regard their respective meetings did not fall in before this present meeting of ours. This meeting having again read and examined the reasons of Belfast, and the answers of Cairncastle thereunto, were all unanimous to delay the determination hereof till the next meeting, and in order to the more clear attaining whereof they have appointed a letter to be sent to Laggan for their advice (the papers of all parties to be transmitted therewith), and withal they have desired the correspondents from Down and Route to signify to their respective meetings that we need and request their correspondents for our assistance at our next meeting, and the Clerk is appointed to signify the like to the meetings of Laggan and Tyrone.

"Ballyclare, *Oct.* 13, 1674.—As to the affair of Mr. Adair his transportation, the Clerk having written to the meetings of Laggan and Tyrone for their judgment herein according to appointment, advice came from these meetings showing their minds to be that he *should* be transported; the correspondent from the meeting of Down signifying that they persist in their former advice to that purpose; no further advice came from Route. This meeting having used all suitable diligence for clearness in this weighty affair, did now resume the consideration thereof; and after some time spent in prayer to God for direction, and a further debating of reasons *pro* and *con*, did at length proceed to a vote, which is, that in consideration of the great good of the Church in the North of Ireland, and the considerable unanimity of the rest of the meetings for said transportation, they judge Mr. P. Adair now called by the providence of God to serve in the ministry at Belfast; whereupon having called before them again Mr. Adair and the Commissioners from Cairncastle and Belfast, did declare Mr. P. Adair now actually transported from Cairncastle to Belfast, and does enjoin him and his family, with the first convenience to repair to Belfast, in order to which some of the brethren were appointed to require those from Belfast to have needful accommodation in readiness for his residing among them, with all expedition. Upon all which the meeting hath delivered the call of Belfast unto Mr. Patrick Adair."*

* The house in which Mr. Adair lived, during his stay in Cairncastle, and which was also probably the residence of his immediate successor, as it certainly was of Mr. Taylor, the third minister, is still standing, and presents a rather antique or somewhat dilapidated appearance. In connexion with the surrounding farm it has been occupied for many years by a family named M'Kee, one member of which — the grandfather of the present occupant—being born in the house, lived in it for nearly one hundred years, and finally died within its walls. Mr. Adair continued in Belfast until his death, in 1694. By his wife, who (as already stated) was a daughter of Sir Robert Adair of Kilhilt and Ballymena, he had at least two sons,—(1) William Adair, who was minister of Ballycastle and Antrim successively; and (2) Patrick Adair, who was minister of Carrickfergus. Respecting the descendants of the latter, some particulars are given by M'Skimmin in his History of Carrickfergus.

The reasons given by Mr. Adair's brethren for his removal from Cairncastle to the more prominent situation of Belfast, are highly creditable to that gentleman, as is also the fact, that the congregation from which he was taken (for so far as his own wishes are stated, they seem to have been in favour of his staying where he was) was very much displeased, by his transportation from amongst them. For some time supplies were appointed, unsolicited, to the widowed Church which had been robbed of her spouse; but the meeting having apparently expected that application should be made to them by Cairncastle to this effect, we read:—

"April 6, 1675.—None appears from Cairncastle, they resenting badly the late transportation. The meeting appoints Mr. Hall and Mr. Anderson to supply there, as also that Mr. Hall, having convocated the masters of families in that Parish on a week day exhort them to endeavour their having the Gospel ministry settled among them; and that they make address unto the meeting for supply, lest they be deprived of that benefice in the future."

Whether outraged and offended Cairncastle so far subdued its pride as to *ask* the meeting for supplies, is not stated. But supplies were certainly *sent*, until June, 1675, at which date the minutes, as now extant, exhibit that lamentable gap which extends to February, 1683, and therefore renders it impossible to state precisely the circumstances connected with the settlement of Mr. Adair's immediate successor in Cairncastle. That successor, however, I believe, for reasons already given, to have been Mr. John Campbell, whom I have therefore set down as the second minister of this Congregation.

(*To be continued.*)

THOUGHTS ON THE FORM AND MANNER OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

The attention which has been drawn to the mode of conducting the religious services of Presbyterian Congregations, by the review of Dr. Lee's book on the Reform of the Church of Scotland, which appeared in *The Christian Unitarian* for February and March, and by the discussions which have since appeared in its pages,

induce me to put on paper a few thoughts which have presented themselves to my mind, and may probably have occurred to others, but which I do not remember to have seen in print, at least in a connected shape. My reading on the subject has been somewhat extensive, and I have had opportunities of observing the usages of various worshipping societies, both in our own denomination and in others; and I submit my ideas to the candid consideration of my brethren, assured that every honest effort to promote a spirit of earnest piety in our churches will be received with indulgence, even if it should not meet with approval.

The religious services of God's house include, according to the views and practices which are commonly received amongst us,—*first*, an invitation or solemn call to the people, to address their hearts to God in the exercises of religious worship;—*secondly*, the worship of God, properly so called, comprising the two great divisions of prayer and praise;—*thirdly*, the reading of the Holy Scriptures;—*fourthly*, a discourse founded upon some text or passage in the Bible; and *fifthly*, a benediction or blessing of the people by the minister.

And here I may remark, that the recital of a creed, which Dr. Lee thinks to be a becoming, and even a *necessary* part of the service,*—and which he is therefore anxious to see enforced in all the congregations of the Church of Scotland,—seems to me to be as unsuitable to the occasion for which the people are assembled on the Lord's day, as it is confessedly unwarranted by the example of the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles, and for several ages afterwards. The formula of baptism given in Matt. xxviii. 19, undoubtedly implies a creed, and was used as such; but it was employed only on occasions of baptism. Its brief and comprehensive terms were afterwards expanded into a form very closely resembling what is now called the Apostles' Creed; which was repeated, (with some local variations,) in the administration of baptism, being then recited by the catechumen himself. It was not till the fifth century that any

* "The reciting of a creed is indispensable on every occasion of public worship or common prayer."—P. 185. (See also p. 158, and elsewhere).

creed was read during public worship in the Greek Church; nor till the sixth that it was introduced into the services of the church in the West; and the creed then employed, was that adopted by the Council of Nice. These were times of corruption. The practice was adopted for the purpose of excluding from the ordinance of public worship, and from its benefits, Christians who dissented from the prevailing doctrines of the time:—and Presbyterians in these lands, of every shade of opinion, have, as it seems to me, done wisely and well in refusing to imitate so pernicious a precedent. Judging from the tenour and spirit of Dr. Lee's book, and from the narrow views which he attributes to his brethren in the Kirk, I should think it likely enough that, if the General Assembly were to accept his advice, and introduce a creed into the worship of the sanctuary,—it might be one the reading of which, week by week, would be very galling to the learned doctor himself. But that is his concern, not ours; for I apprehend there is not a Non-Subscribing Church in the world which would, for a moment, think of adopting such a practice.

And now a few words on each department of the service, as above enumerated.

1. The *Invitation*, or call to the people to unite in God's worship, should be brief, pointed, and appropriate. And such, I must bear testimony, it has been, whenever and wherever I have been present at the religious services in any of our churches. It usually consists of a single sentence, and never, in my opinion, ought to exceed the length of two or three, whether selected from Scripture or composed by the minister himself. Dr. Lee, from his reiterated declarations of the necessity of some such introduction to the service, seems to labour under the impression that it is omitted in the forms of worship used in several, if not most, of the congregations of the Established Church of Scotland. I apprehend that he is mistaken in this: at all events, so far as my experience extends, such a call or exhortation is universally pronounced by the minister in all our Non-Subscribing Churches before commencing the act of divine worship.

2. *Prayer* is the most solemn, I might almost call it *awful*, exercise in which a human being, or any finite

being, can engage. In it he places himself in the expressly acknowledged presence of the Omniscient God, and calls upon the heart-searching and the Holy One to hear his words and accept his adoration. Can the words which are to be employed on such an occasion be too thoughtfully weighed? To rush unprepared into the presence of the Eternal, and to address him in language that is unconsidered and unpremeditated, and which *may*, therefore, be mean, extravagant, inappropriate, or offensively familiar, is rash and indecent; and would be reckoned impious, if habit had not, in many churches, familiarized both the speaker and the hearers to the irreverent and unbecoming practice. It was, no doubt, partly for the purpose of preventing such inconveniences, (but still more, as I conceive, for the purpose of preventing the clergy from running, in their prayers, out of the groove of orthodoxy,) that the hierarchies of Greece, of Syria, of Rome, and of England have prescribed a formal liturgy, which every minister in every one of these churches is obliged to use, and from which no deviation whatever is tolerated. Dr. Lee is so impressed with the *badness* of the prayers that are habitually presented by his Scottish brethren, that he is anxious to have a liturgy prepared for their use, and put forth by authority of the General Assembly. He would not, however, require them to employ it on all occasions, nor would he, apparently, compel them, when using it, to abstain altogether from introducing alterations, additions, or omissions which they might consider expedient. To such a *qualified* sanction of a Book of Common Prayer, I can see little objection; nor would I feel any scruple in employing a prayer book so put forth,—if only it were such that, *in the main, and reserving to myself the liberty of occasional change*,—I could conscientiously approve of it. But there are manifold difficulties in the way of introducing such a form into our Non-Subscribing Churches. Every congregation would, I apprehend, insist, (and properly insist,) on having the book so prepared as to suit its own views and sentiments; not merely the views and sentiments of the majority of its members, but those of the whole of them; for in matters of conscience none can be constrained. This would effectually hinder the compilation or selection

of the work by any of our existing ecclesiastical organizations. The task of preparing or selecting it would then devolve on our congregations separately; and this might possibly result in the preparation of as many different books as there are individual churches. There can be little doubt that a considerable number of prayer-books would come into use; and thus the liturgies would become not a bond of union, as in the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches, but a disintegrating force. I may illustrate this by a case in point. In London and its neighbourhood, there are, according to *The Unitarian Almanac* for this year, seventeen Unitarian Congregations; in most of these, free prayer is offered up; in five or six, liturgies are employed: *but no less than four different books of common prayer are in use among them!* I may add, that the latest of these compilations is not employed even in the church in which its editor officiates. Since that book was published, a congregation in Dublin has adopted a liturgical service; but, instead of taking any of the existing prayer-books, it has compiled a new one, for it own sole and separate use. Whatever, therefore, may be the case in bodies which are regulated by law, it is evident that, *amongst us*, the introduction of liturgies is not a means of attaining unity, but of making existing differences more conspicious; of handing them down to posterity; and of thereby fostering tendencies to division, already sufficiently numerous. Add to this, the well-known fact, that in most of our congregations there is so strong a feeling of attachment to our long-established Presbyterian forms, (of which that of free prayer is the most striking,) that no change which would rudely and roughly clash with them could be introduced, without rending each society to its foundations. It must be obvious, that whatever may be the evils that exist in our community in reference to public prayer, the remedy is not to be sought for in the use of liturgical services.

And here I feel myself called upon to protest against the supposition that the evils which Dr. Lee asserts to be existing and notorious in the devotional exercises of the clergy of the Church of Scotland, exist in the same degree,—if at all,—in those conducted by the Non-Subscribing ministers in Ireland. He says the prayers of

his Scottish brethren are often rambling and incoherent: I have never heard a prayer in any of our churches that could, with propriety or justice, be so described. He says that Scottish ministers frequently make use of low, mean, and disgustingly familiar expressions in their addresses to the Deity; from this crying evil, I feel myself warranted in affirming that our congregations are free. He says the prayers of his brethren are often historical, argumentative, and declamatory,—or else puling, affected, and sentimental: I believe there are few indeed of my brother ministers whose devotional exercises can be fairly charged with these faults. The last objection he urges is that the prayers of a minister who prays *extempore*, are apt to become, in time, stereotyped forms, which, once impressed upon his mind, are never varied; thus producing a sameness which breeds weariness and disgust in the hearer, and occasioning all the ills of a prescribed liturgy without any of its advantages. The existence of this danger cannot be denied; and it certainly is one against which every minister of the Gospel ought to endeavour most scrupulously to guard.

But, in my humble judgment, he can guard himself effectually against this, and all the other evils and deficiencies enumerated by Dr. Lee, without having recourse to the extreme measure of employing a printed form of prayer; especially one in the preparation of which he may have had neither vote nor voice. Let him prepare, (as he ought to do,) his prayers, as carefully as he prepares his sermons; or rather let him prepare them with still greater care, inasmuch as they constitute by far the most important part of his ministrations. Let him carefully write out a series of prayers for congregational use; a series not merely consisting of as many prayers as may be required for one Lord's Day, but for four, five, or six weeks: for four weeks at the very least. I do not say they should all be composed in the same week, or in the same month; but let him not consider that he has completed his ministerial preparations till he has composed as many prayers as I have indicated above. In preparing these forms, he not only *may*, but in my opinion *ought*, to have resource to the devotional works which have been published by ministers and others of approved piety and

judgment; and these he ought, I think, to use (especially in the commencement of his ministerial labours,) not merely as models of arrangement, style, and so forth, but as repertories from which he should extract those thanksgivings, confessions, and supplications best calculated to excite and animate his devotional feelings, and best adapted to the religious and moral condition of the people among whom his lot is cast. These prayers he should frequently review in his closet; introducing whatever changes may seem to himself to be useful or desirable; and never rest satisfied with them till he can conscientiously declare that they are as good as it is in his power to make them. The same course he should pursue with his prayers for the communion, for baptisms, marriages, visitations of the sick, funerals, and other special occasions on which he may be called on to officiate. He would do well to provide himself with a *variety* of forms of prayer to be used on each of these occasions. By the employment of these carefully composed or compiled forms of prayer, he would most effectually guard himself against the danger of falling into any of the evil habits against which Dr. Lee so fervently protests; and would at the same time secure that variety in his public ministrations which would contribute greatly to their interest and value to his people.

But it may be asked,—"Do I expect that every minister, especially every young minister, will be able to carry in his memory such a body of prayer as I have described?" No. I do not expect that any minister, young or old, will be able to do so. In fact I should rather recommend that none should attempt to do so. "How then can these so elaborately composed forms be used?" *Simply by reading them.* There is no need to commit them to memory. There is no more sin or shame in reading a prayer than in reading a sermon; and no preacher among us thinks it wrong to adopt the latter practice. It may be thought that our people would not like it; and probably at first some of them would not. However, in our pulpit exercises generally, but more especially in our devotional exercises, the gratification of our hearers' fancies, tastes, and prejudices,—when they appear to militate against the higher aims of ministerial life and duty, should have no

weight at all. I cannot doubt that the method which I have recommended would be found to be very conducive to the growth of an earnest interest in the religious services of our Churches ; and even those who might at first object to the minister for reading his prayers, would soon find out that *his read prayers* were so much more serious, devout, and spirit-moving than those of other preachers who did not adopt the practice,—so superior to what his own prayers were before he adopted it,—that they would be grateful to him for the reform which they had at first disliked as an innovation.

Some farther observations on this subject I reserve for a future communication. I shall only at present remark, that prayers constructed as I have recommended, would be in the strictest sense of the word, *free prayers ;* as free as those bawled forth by the wildest ranter that ever roared in a conventicle ; and far more likely than they to be free from irreverence, vulgarity, and extravagance.

E. F.

NARRATIVES FROM REAL LIFE.

WILLIAM K——.

"And the Lord God prepared a gourd, and made it to come up over Jonah, that it might be a shadow over his head, to deliver him from his grief. So Jonah was exceeding glad of the gourd. But God prepared a worm, when the morning rose the next day, and it smote the gourd that it withered."—JONAH iv. 6, 7.

WILLIAM K—— was born at T—— in the autumn of 1821. His father, after several years of military service, had both his legs shot off in battle, in consequence of which being discharged from the army, he came to reside in his native town ; but although thus disabled for active life, he diligently employed himself in the religious instruction of his household, bringing up his children in the fear of God, and leading them by his own example in the ways of righteousness and peace. It is not, therefore, surprising that under the teaching of such a father a degree of seriousness should be produced on William's mind, and that he should be distinguished for great sweetness of temper and an affectionate disposition.

At an early age he was sent to the Sunday School

connected with the congregation of which his father was a member, and there, under the Divine blessing, he was not only taught to read, but also seriously to feel the value and importance of the Word of truth. He loved the house of God and the Sunday School, and shewed by his uniformly regular attendance, and good behaviour, that his heart was there. For some time his parents resided more than a mile from the town; but whoever else was absent, William K—— was not found wanting. At home, he was dutiful to his parents and industrious in his habits, and at school much attached to his teachers and attentive to his lessons; indeed every way his conduct was such as to make him a comfort and a credit both to the family and to the school to which he belonged.

He seemed to possess an understanding beyond his years, was very fond of reading the Scriptures and singing hymns, was regular in his morning and evening prayers, and would frequently question his father upon subjects of religion. For the last twelve months of his life he was sent to the British School on week-days, and was much beloved by the master and scholars on account of his amiable disposition and his rapid progress in all that he learned. And the knowledge he gained himself he delighted to communicate to others, of which he gave a striking instance in his regularly visiting of his own accord a poor, aged, and much afflicted woman, to read to her that Word of truth which she could not read herself.

When in health his books were his delight, and when sickness came upon him they were constantly by his side. His father had a garden in a field at some distance from his house, but not being able to work in it on account of the loss of his legs, William usually accompanied him thither and laboured hard, "wishing" (as he said) "to be as useful as possible to his disabled parent." On one of those occasions they were suddenly overtaken by a violent storm of rain, accompanied with thunder and lightning, and having no place of shelter near, were much exposed to it. As the thunder loudly pealed over their heads, and the lightning flashed around them, his father said, "Willie, are you not afraid?" "No, father," he replied; "we read in the Bible that thunder is the

voice of the Lord, and if it is *His* voice, what should make us afraid? If God keeps us we are as safe here, though wet and uncomfortable, as at home or in any other place." And what he said he seemed to feel, for his young heart was deeply impressed with a practical sense of the omniscience and omnipresence of God.

As an instance of his devotional feelings it may be mentioned that one Sunday morning after his father had, as usual, read the Scriptures and engaged in prayer with the family, William proposed that they should connect with their social worship the singing of a hymn. "I have looked out a very beautiful one," said he, "for us to sing before going to school, and if agreeable will read it." The hymn was given out, the family sang it, and at its conclusion, the children ran off to school with light and cheerful hearts. The parents of the dear boy had often looked forward with joyful expectation to the time in which he should be grown up and settled in the world, and prove the solace and comfort of their declining years. But God had otherwise appointed. He had always been a weakly child from his birth, and in the autumn of 1832 symptoms of consumption appeared; but notwithstanding every effort was used to stop its progress, the power of medicine failed, and poor William had to be carried by his school-fellows to an early grave. The illness which terminated in his death lasted about thirteen weeks, four of which he was confined to his bed, and during this period I had frequent opportunities of seeing and conversing with him on the state of his mind in the prospect of eternity. I think I shall never forget when, on one occasion, as I sat by his bed, he stretched out his little wasted arm and thin white hand to clasp my own, and thank me for coming to see him, "for," said he, "I want you to pray with and read to me, and afterwards to explain to me *what faith is*." I explained the word to him as simply as I could, on which he said, "Thank you, sir, thank you; I have read a good deal about faith in my Testament, and I feared I did not understand the word aright." When at length it was evident that he could not recover, I said to him one day, "Willie, do you think that when you die you will go to heaven?" "Yes," said he, "I hope and believe I

shall; for, although I am a sinner, Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, and he will not think me too young to be saved, for he said, 'Suffer little children to come to me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.'" I had much conversation with him at different times of a similar kind and equally satisfactory. Being at length so much reduced that he could neither sit up in bed nor read his Bible any more, he desired his father and mother and others to read it to him, particularly delighting in different parts of St. John's First Epistle. On one occasion, after praying with him, his father asked him if he was afraid to die. "Oh no, father, no," said he; "but still if it was God's will to raise me up and give me health, and let me go to school again, I should like to live a little longer."

Calling to see him one day a short time before his death, I solemnly committed him to God in prayer. His parents were in the room, and giving them an earnest look, he said, "I feel that my time here will not be long, and there is one thing I wish before I die—to be wrapped up in a blanket and carried to the school, that I may once more look upon my school-fellows and bid them farewell." His mother, anxious to gratify him, took him out of bed and carried him in her arms to the school. After this he sank rapidly. He took leave of his friends, and distributed his books and some little toys as remembrances among his companions. "One book there is," said he, "which I have highly prized; it is the one given to me by the teachers in the Sunday School as a reward for giving out the hymns at the last anniversary sermon; and who so proper to have that as my dear father!" "And there is one more thing," he added, "the little race-horse toy which I have kept safe so long. I wish *that* to be given to Mr. M—— for his little boy; it may serve to remind him of me when I am gone." Observing his father weeping at the foot of the bed, he comforted him as well as he was able, saying, "Dear father, don't cry; but come, put your hand under my head." His father did so, after which he appeared easier than before. For some time before he died he lay very still, and it was thought that all was over; but on a sudden he raised his right hand, clasped that of his father, gently pressed

it, fixed his eyes upon him, and expired. He died, January 1st, 1833, aged eleven years and three months. As a mark of regard, his funeral was attended by a procession of many of his school-fellows, headed by the master of the British and the superintendent of the Sunday School.

THOMAS H——.

Thomas H—— was the son of irreligious parents. When he was very young his mother died, and his unnatural father deserted him, in consequence of which the poor lad was sent to the parish workhouse, at that time a sad receptacle of dirt and wretchedness, and where Thomas learned little but wickedness and idleness. No Sunday School received him, no friend advised, no teacher admonished him, and thus he grew up in rags and ignorance.

When about eleven years old he was employed by a baker in the town to carry pies for sale to the public houses, and to cry them about the streets. His companions were bad boys like himself, and they often invited him to do evil. One night he was detected in the act of stealing lead. For this he was apprehended, and was sent by the magistrates to D—— jail. While in prison an illness, which had seized him before his commitment, grew much worse, and it was evident that his constitution was broken up. At the expiration of the term for which he was imprisoned, he left the jail with the intention of returning to T——. At S—— (about half way), feeling himself ill and weak, and unable to reach T—— that evening, he lay down and slept in a cart under a shed. The night was frosty, and when he rose in the morning he had scarcely strength left to crawl on his way. At length he managed to reach T——, and was taken in by a poor woman who kept a lodging house, and it was there I first saw him. It was evident that he could not live long, so I spoke to him plainly and at once of his approaching change. He heard with apparent attention, but he was so deplorably ignorant that he scarcely knew that there was a God or that he had a soul. As the sun was shining in the room at the time, I took occasion from it to speak of Him

who had made the sun—who had also made him—and to whom he was accountable. I also spoke of the Saviour, and of the merciful errand on which he came, &c., and in some measure I had reason to hope my efforts were successful. Before his departure he was brought to feel his need of salvation, and in deep penitence to cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner!" I was with him when he died, and was in prayer at the time. He was perfectly sensible, and seemed to unite with me fervently, but could not speak. His death took place about three weeks after I first saw him. He was apparently about fourteen years of age.

Who that knew William K—— and Thomas H——, and saw what religious instruction had done for the one, and the want of it had done for the other, could fail to be a zealous friend to Sunday Schools!

INTELLIGENCE.

CONVENTION OF AMERICAN UNITARIANS.

The first annual Convention of the American Unitarian Church, met at the Broadway Athenæum (Dr. Osgood's Old Church), on Wednesday morning, April 5. On the previous evening, by appointment, the Rev. J. F. Clarke preached before the delegates who had assembled, taking for his text Acts viii. 46. At 10 o'clock A.M., Dr. Bellows called the Convention to order, and after prayer by Dr. Elliot, of St. Louis, moved that the Rev. A. P. Putnam be chosen as temporary chairman. He then proceeded to read the resolution of the American Unitarian Association which called the Convention, as well as the preliminary papers sent to the Churches. The Rev. Dr. Stebbins reported the following list of officers, who were unanimously elected:—

President—Hon. John A. Andrew, of Massachusetts.

Vice-Presidents—Hon. Thomas D. Elliot, Hon. John G. Palfrey, Mass.; Hon. Wayman Crow, St. Louis, Mo.; Ichabod Goodwin, Portsmouth, N. H.; A. A. Lowe, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Wm. C. Bryant, New York; Rev. Orville Dewey, D.D., Mass.; Rev. E. S. Gannett, D.D., Boston; Rev. G. W. Hosmer, D.D., Buffalo.

Secretaries—Rev. E. E. Hale, Boston; Rev. Carlton A. Staples, Milwaukie, Wis.; J. H. Frothingham, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Treasurer—H. P. Kidder, Boston.

The nomination of Gov. Andrew was greeted with hearty applause. His Excellency ascended the platform, and after the applause had subsided, spoke as follows:—

In the presence of this august assemblage, composed of so large a number of the clergy and laity of our denomination, I approach the task, to which by your favour I have been assigned, with more diffidence than I will attempt to express. I am certain that it might have been more worthily bestowed, but I am not sure that it could have been more cordially accepted, and I am sure that its labours will be at least faithfully undertaken. I congratulate you, fathers and brethren, upon the providential and auspicious omens, personal, national, and universal, under which this Convention assembles to-day. Whether we speak each one of us the language of his own heart, or whether, as citizens of our America, we speak the language of a victorious republic, or whether, as members of the great family of men, we speak the voice of universal humanity, we may thank God and take courage. The advancing progress of our armies and the events of current history are opening and reopening new duties to us, whether as citizens or as professors of a religious faith. It becomes us, then, brethren, to unite ourselves in purposes not of doubtful disputation, but with the purpose of giving ourselves to a revelation of good works, so that the banner of Christ may be carried forward as far and as fast as the opening way of Providence reveals itself to human work, usefulness, zeal, and faith. But, brethren, it does not become me to occupy the opening moments of this morning hour with words or speech of my own. I will endeavour to set and prescribe a commendable example of brevity to those who hereafter may follow me. Let us give ourselves, then, to the work of organizing the business for which we are assembled. Any motion which any gentleman may make in the interest of furthering the organization will now be in order.

The Rev. E. Hale submitted two resolutions,—one, that a permanent committee on business and its order, and of the rules of debate, be now appointed, to report at the opening of the afternoon session; the other, that till the report of this committee be received, the time of the Convention should be occupied with hearing reports from the several organizations connected with the denomination, in the following order:—The American Unitarian Association; the Western Conference; the Maine Unitarian Conference; the Meadville Theological School; the Unitarian Association of New York; the New Hampshire Association; the Sunday-School Society; and the Massachusetts Evangelical Missionary Society.

Mr. A. A. Lowe, of Brooklyn, then rose and said he occupied a position from which a layman might well shrink, but he felt constrained to make a few remarks. The committee of ten that had issued this call had seen fit to go beyond their authority in making arrangements for this Convention. They had appointed the Rev. J. F. Clarke to deliver a discourse, which, in Mr. Lowe's opinion, should have been reserved to a later period. He conceived that the Convention was free to adopt such views and action as it saw fit. The sermon last evening might be construed into an authoritative exposition of what the Convention should do. The speaker

took issue with the reverend gentleman's view of Paul's change of base. Every Christian reform had but one and the same base, which was Christ. We should proclaim, in no uncertain sound, our allegiance to the Head of the Church, and he came before the Convention to challenge assent or dissent to certain resolutions which he was about to offer, but which it would be out of his power to offer after the adoption of those just submitted.

Dr. Bellows said that Mr. Lowe was deliberately over-riding the order of the committee, and if we permitted the best man to do that, adieu to all order. The Chair ruled that the speaker must confine himself to the resolutions before the meeting. Mr. Lowe then offered, as a substitute for the resolution before the meeting, a preamble and resolution to the effect that the Convention should claim the assent of all who participate in it to the following fundamental doctrines:—1. Belief in the Holy Scripture as containing a revelation of God to man and as deduced therefrom. 2. Belief in one God, the Father. 3. Belief in one Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, the Son of God, and his specially appointed messenger and representative to our race, gifted with supernatural powers, approved of God by miracles, and signs, and wonders, which God did by him. 4. Belief in the Holy Ghost, the Comforter. 5. Belief in the forgiveness of sin, the resurrection from the dead, and life everlasting.

Hon. T. D. Elliot, of New Bedford, suggested that as the resolutions of Mr. Lowe were not amendatory, and therefore not in order, they should be offered at a subsequent stage and be referred to a committee. Mr. Lowe assented to the suggestion and withdrew his resolutions. The resolutions offered by Mr. Hale were then adopted.

Mr. Lowe now offered his resolutions. Mr. Elliot, with the assent of Mr. Lowe, moved that they be laid on the table until the Convention have a suitable opportunity to take them up. Carried.

Dr. Stebbins, as President of the Unitarian Association, read a report from its Executive Committee, which gave a sketch of its several operations since its formation in 1825,—referring particularly to its missionary efforts, including the Indian Mission under the Rev. Mr. Dall, and its publishing department. Since the war commenced it had printed 19 army tracts, and the Soldier's Companion; and also one thousand copies each of Eliot's Discipline of Sorrow, Channing's Thoughts, and Ware's Silent Pastor. They were distributing tracts at the rate of 5,000 weekly, by seventy volunteer agents in the army and the hospitals. This work had opened their eyes to a greater work, and at a special meeting of the Association held last autumn, it was resolved to raise for the work of the year one hundred thousand dollars —and of that sum seventy-seven thousand had already been raised. Reports were next given in successively by the Western Conference, the Maine Conference, the New Hampshire Association and the New York Association, the Society for promoting Theological Education, the Sunday-School Society, The Meadville Theological School, and Antioch College. In the report on the Meadville School it was stated by the Rev. A. A. Livermore, its President, that the Institution was founded in 1844,

by the united labours of the Unitarian and Christian denominations. The object was to educate young men for the Christian ministry, and students of all denominations were admitted to the School, it being provided by the act of incorporation, that no doctrinal test shall ever be made a condition of enjoying the opportunities of instruction in the School except a belief in the Divine Origin of Christianity. During the 21 years of its existence about 200 persons have been members of the School, and more than 100 have received its diploma.

At the Afternoon session the several reports were laid on the table; the report of the Committee on Business was then taken up, and the Conference next proceeded to consider the subject of Missions.

The Rev. A. D. Mayo said that ten years ago he went to the West to preach Liberal Christianity. He found himself almost alone, surrounded by Orthodox agencies, and he made but little headway. He was convinced that the work was useless, unless backed by a powerful organized body. We need more of this organization to do our work. He mentioned three agencies. 1. The spread of tracts and papers. As an illustration of the good to be done in this way he gave facts. He had distributed Mr. Ware's tracts by thousands among the soldiers in the hospitals of Cincinnati, and they had carried them in their knapsacks to the battle of Chickamauga and in Sherman's splendid march through Georgia, reading and lending them. 2. We must send missionaries to the capitals of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Here he spoke of an encouraging letter which he had received from a distinguished judge, expressing the desire to have a Liberal Church in the town in which he lived. 3. The establishment of new societies in large centres of population. Missionary work was required in a large portion of the West, and the result of judicious efforts would be productive of good results.

Hon. Thomas D. Elliot, of New Bedford, believed this was the first opportunity afforded by the Unitarian associations for laymen to speak on matters of business. It was time laymen had something to say. At first Unitarian churches stood isolated and alone. Forty years ago a kind of association was begun. The whole power of the denomination should be excited to sustain the different agencies at work. The call was urgent. This gathering could not have taken place five years ago, and could not have been postponed another year. The South called for us now, and we must go into the new field. Nearly one hundred thousand dollars had recently been raised by the Unitarian Association, and he hoped a large portion would reach the home of secession.

The Rev. Mr. Collyer, of Chicago, presented the needs of the West. He narrated many interesting incidents which had occurred in his preaching and lecturing through this section. There were men on the broad prairies hungering for the bread of life which we had to give. He had received a letter recently, stating that eleven years ago the writer was converted to Liberal Christianity, and he had lived several years in Jacksonville without ever hearing a liberal gospel preached, until in disgust he was compelled to stay away from preaching. This was only one of many illustrations.

He urged this subject on the convention with power and eloquence.

Dr. BELLOWS wished to present the claims of the Pacific coast. No person was ever more successful than brother King. His ministry in California was a personal success, but it would be a mistake to suppose that it was only this. There was a vitality in our Church at San Francisco which did not make its existence dependent on any person, and Mr. King's success was one of principles as well as personal. No region would more heartily welcome Liberal Christianity than that coast, and nowhere would it meet with less obstacles. He then passed to a more general consideration of the topic, saying that we had a most solemn duty, and, though we did not believe that men were hanging over a pit, and ready to fall into eternal flames yet they were living in sin, and there were at present hells in New York, out of which we were bound to lift men. Dr. Bellows closed with an earnest and eloquent plea for greater devotion in the work of Christianizing the world.

At the Evening Session the subject of the increase of the ministry, and the support and endowment of Colleges was taken up.

The Rev. Mr. HALE submitted a resolution that it was of the first importance that five professorships should be endowed at Antioch College before the next commencement. Of the 2,500,000 people in Ohio 2,000,000 were not recognized as Christians by the Orthodox Churches. For their benefit he hoped to see the College maintained. It was a broader question than the supply of ministers. This College would become a great educating power and do much to mould opinion and shape the civilization of the future in the West. Where were the young men of the West to be trained? Cambridge could not do it. The work must be done there. Forty thousand dollars had been promised before the Convention assembled, and yesterday one gentleman had given five thousand dollars in addition, and he hoped before they went home more would be obtained towards the desired one hundred thousand dollars. For the accomplishment of this object we had a right to call on the richer and older communities for the needed help.

The Rev. S. J. MAY, of Syracuse, rose to give the disinterested testimony of a distinguished professor of the West, an Episcopalian, in favour of a College of the Liberal faith, who said he was satisfied that a great proportion of the minds of young men in that section are not to be impressed by any instruction received from Orthodox sources.

Other speeches urged at some length the endowment of Antioch College. And at the appointed hour the meeting was closed with prayer by the Rev. Dr. Osgood.

SECOND DAY.—The Morning session was opened with prayer by Dr. Gannett. The resolutions recommending the endowment of Antioch were passed, and a committee appointed to carry out the object.

The Rev. Dr. BELLOWS, on behalf of the committee, offered a report recommending "a National Conference of Unitarian Churches," consisting of three delegates from each Church, to meet annually. A draft of a proposed constitution and by-laws accompanied the report. The preamble to the constitution spoke of the obligations

of all disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ to prove their faith by self-denial, and by the devotion of their lives and possessions to the service of God and the building up of the kingdom of his Son.

The Rev. Mr. WASSON, of Cincinnati, did not think this constitution would meet the wants of the times. All Christian sects accepted the Lord Jesus Christ; but the Orthodox, when they spoke of him, meant God. While the speaker recognized the leadership of Christ, he did not wish to use a name which had an uncertain signification. He could not accept a Lord who was not God. The term, Son of God, should not be confined in its application to Jesus Christ. The speaker's remarks were aimed at the expressions in the preamble, "God and his Son" and "disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ."

The chair ruled that this preamble would not come up for adoption until each of the articles had been disposed of.

The first article was then taken up for consideration.

C. C. BURLEIGH, of Florence, Mass., claimed that Paul used the expression "Mister" (translated "Master") "Jesus Christ" and not "Lord Jesus Christ."

The Rev. Dr. LOTHROP, of Boston, called the speaker to order, inasmuch as he represented no Church.

The SECRETARY stated that the credentials of Mr. Burleigh had been received. The Chair stated that, as the preamble was not under discussion, the speaker's remarks were not in order.

Mr. BURLEIGH apologized for not having spoken to the subject, and concluded with a few general remarks.

The Rev. Dr. CLARKE, of Boston, moved to amend by adding after "Unitarian," the words "and Independent," so as to read "Unitarian and Independent Churches."

The Rev. Dr. BELLOWS thought that this was not the time to introduce that amendment, but that it would be a proper question for a future Convention to consider, when the "broad Church" basis would be proposed.

The Rev. Dr. CLARKE consented to withdraw his amendment with some reluctance.

Mr. PARK, of Roxbury, moved to strike out "Unitarian," and insert "Free Christian." Mr. Harlow, of Medford, seconded the amendment.

The Rev. Dr. OSGOOD, of New York, said that while we had affinity for other Christian bodies, we came here as Unitarians. He preferred the name "Broad Church Unitarians."

Mr. LIVERMORE, of Cambridge, regretted the motion to amend. The laymen would not consent to relinquish the name Unitarian.

The Rev. Mr. BUCKINGHAM, of Troy, had been long opposed to the use of the name Unitarian.

Mr. MILLS, of Brooklyn, preferred to go with Mr. Lowe and have a creed, to abandoning the name Unitarian. The majority of the Second Unitarian Society of Brooklyn were in favour of an expression of belief. He was opposed to uniting with rag, tag, and bobtail.

The Rev. Dr. ELIOT moved the previous question.

The amendment of Mr. Park was then put and lost by a decisive

vote. The first article of the constitution was then adopted as reported.

The second article, providing for an annual Convention, consisting of one clerical and two lay delegates from each Church, was then considered.

Hon. J. G. PALFREY, of Boston, suggested an amendment to allow three lay delegates, when the Society chose not to send their minister.

The Rev. Dr. BELLOWS thought that there ought to be at least one minister to two laymen.

The amendment was withdrawn and the article was adopted.

The remaining articles were adopted without debate.

The Rev. Mr. AMES, of Albany, moved to add an article as follows:—"Nothing in this constitution shall be construed to exclude from representation in this body any Church which chooses to co-operate with us in Christian work."

The Rev. Dr. BELLOWS said that the result of the adoption of that article would be to swamp the boat. He had found the attachment to the Unitarian name was such that it would be dangerous to adopt such a provision.

The Rev. Dr. ELIOT, of St. Louis, was opposed to the adoption of the article as amended. There was no danger in the direction of liberality in admitting delegates, but there was danger in inviting all kinds of Societies. A Mormon Christian Church existed in St. Louis, and would you admit that?

The question now came up on the adoption of the preamble.

A motion was made to lay the preamble on the table.

The Rev. Dr. BELLOWS said that if the preamble should be laid on the table, the whole constitution would fail. It would then seem as if Unitarians had no coherence, no status, and no future.

The motion to lay the preamble on the table was lost by a decisive vote.

The Rev. Dr. CLARKE wished to correct an impression created from a newspaper report of Mr Lowe's remarks, that he (Dr. C.) was not in favour of Christ as the foundation of our religion. He wished emphatically to say that we came here as Christians.

The preamble was then adopted by a very decisive vote. The articles and preamble having been separately adopted, the constitution and preamble was then voted for and passed, we think, by a majority of nine-tenths of the Convention. The preamble and constitution as amended was as follows:—

Preamble.—Whereas, the great opportunities and demands for Christian labour and consecration at this time increase our sense of the obligations of all disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ to prove their faith by self-denial, and by the devotion of their lives and possessions to the service of God and the building up of the Kingdom of his Son.

Article First.—Therefore, the Christian Churches of the Unitarian faith here assembled unite themselves in a common body, to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian Churches, to the end of re-organizing and stimulating the denomination with which

they are connected to the largest exertions in the cause of Christian faith and work.

Article Second.—The National Conference shall be composed of such delegates elected annually, not to exceed three from any Church (including its minister who shall officially be one), as any of our Churches may accredit to it by a certificate of their appointment.

Article Third.—The American Unitarian Association, the Western Conference, and such other theological, academic, or humane organizations in our body as the Conference may see fit to invite, shall be entitled to representation by no more than three delegates each.

Article Fourth.—The Conference shall meet annually at such time as it may designate at its successive annual sessions.

Article Fifth.—The officers shall consist of a president, six vice-presidents, three secretaries—an honorary, a recording, and corresponding secretary—and a council of ten—half ministers and half laymen—who shall be elected at each meeting, to hold their office for one year and until their successors are appointed.

Article Sixth.—The council of ten shall have charge, during the intervals of the annual sessions, of all business having reference to the interests of the Conference, and entrusted it by that body, which is hereby declared a purely advisory one.

Article Seventh.—The National Conference, until further advised by its experience, adopts the existing organizations of the Unitarian body as the instruments of its power, and confines itself to the recommending to them such undertakings and methods as it judges to be in the heart of the Unitarian denomination.

Article Eighth.—The foregoing constitution may be amended at any regular meeting of the Conference by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the delegates accredited thereto.

At the Afternoon session the by-laws were considered and adopted. The Rev. C. J. Ames proposed a resolution recognizing fellowship and co-operation with other Churches. This led to much discussion, some contending that the basis of union should be absolutely free. The Rev. Dr. Bellows said he had a serious objection to bodies of men claiming to be the peculiar champions of liberty. He yielded to no one in devotion to the spirit of liberty. If intolerance was to be found at all, it was among those who sneered at conservatives and thanked God that they were not such—sneered at those who wanted to conserve that which they deemed eternal truth. He belonged to that class who wanted to control the spirit of the age. He accepted none of the taunts about the disgrace of this Convention. He desired the sympathy and affection of both sides; but if he had to choose between the two, he frankly avowed that he would go rather with Orthodoxy, in any form in which it could be stated, than with those who would put Jesus Christ into comparative contempt. We have made a constitution for the purpose of holding the latter to it, and if the issue is made we shall gain ten firm, good Christians for every one we lose.

The Rev. Dr. Clarke, of Boston, said that all questions of naturalism and supernaturalism were nothing to the need of reaching blighted souls.

The Rev. Mr. MAYO, of Cincinnati, inquired if Mr. Ames intended a simple committee on correspondence, followed by a report?

The CHAIRMAN said that that would be the effect of the resolution.

The Rev. Mr. PUTNAM, of Brooklyn, moved to amend the resolution by substituting another, being in substance the articles of belief submitted yesterday by Mr. Lowe, with a different preamble.

A point of order was raised as to the relevancy of the amendment, and the Chair ruled that Mr. Lowe's resolution having been laid on the table, this being the same in substance, could not be entertained.

The Rev. Mr. PUTNAM then moved the previous question on Mr. Ames' resolution, which was ordered.

The resolution of Mr. Ames was adopted.

The Rev. Mr. PUTNAM then renewed his offer of a preamble and resolutions involving five articles of belief, and said he regretted that Mr. Lowe, and others of like views, had not been allowed a freer expression of their opinions. He was opposed to the preamble and resolutions to which Mr. Lowe's *statement of faith* was appended, because they imposed a test of Christian fellowship, and seemed to aim at exclusion. He would have the statement adopted as a simple declaration of belief, to assure our own friends and make it known to others, that as a denomination, we hold to what is vital and fundamental in Christianity. This was the more necessary after what various speakers had said during the morning. He could not see how any Christian Church could materially dissent from such a statement. Yet he would not have it a creed in any obnoxious sense, and he offered a preamble to that effect, in place of the preamble and resolutions submitted by Mr. Lowe.

On motion of Dr. Stebbins the subject was laid on the table. This was concurred in by Mr. Putnam. Subsequently Dr. Lothrop moved, and Mr. Putnam seconded the motion, that they be taken up and referred to the council, which was passed.

Resolutions were afterwards passed recommending that one hundred thousand dollars should be raised annually, for the purposes of the denomination, that one hundred thousand dollars should be raised before the first day of June for the endowment of Antioch College, and that the council should urge, as soon as it may seem expedient, the necessity and duty of creating an organ for the denomination, to be called the *Liberal Christian*. A patriotic resolution was next passed, thanks were voted to Governor Andrews for presiding, and the proceedings were closed with prayer by the Rev. Dr. Hall.

At the termination of the Conference there was a festival in the Academy of Music, at which over three thousand persons were present. At 8 o'clock P. Cooper, Esq. took the chair, and a blessing was asked by the Rev. Dr. Dewey. Speeches bearing on the object of the Conference were delivered by Governor Andrew, Dr. Gannett, W. C. Bryant, Esq., Dr. Eliot, the Hon. John C. Palfrey, Judge Hoar, the Rev. W. H. Channing, Dr. Osgood, and the Hon T. D. Elliot. The Convention then ended, and the assembly dispersed.

UNITARIAN SOCIETY FOR THE DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

On Sunday, May 14th, the Rev W. J. Odgers, of Bath, preached the Annual Sermons in behalf of this Society. In the forenoon he preached in the First Meeting-house, taking for his text, Rom. i. 23—"They changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man," and in the afternoon he preached in the Second Meeting house, from Rom. xv. 13—"Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing." After each sermon a collection was taken up in aid of the Society's funds.

On Monday evening, May 15th, at seven o'clock, the Annual Meeting of the Society was held in the First Presbyterian Meeting-house, Rosemary Street.

On the motion of Michael Andrews, Esq., the Rev. J. Scott Porter was called to the chair.

The Rev. J. A. Crozier opened the proceedings by prayer.

The Chairman, after some preliminary remarks, said—The more I am advanced in life—the more I know of the working of the human mind, and the influences that are employed in bringing society forward to a higher state of moral and spiritual advancement,—the more I feel the truth of that of which I was always convinced—namely, the essential doctrines of Christianity, as they are understood and professed by Unitarians generally. I believe without religion small progress indeed can be made in morality or virtue; and I believe if religion is to be presented to the human mind in accordance with the views of thinking men—of those that love their kind and love their God—it must closely approximate to that professed by Christian Unitarians. I am, therefore, glad to be able in any way in my power to advance such principles. Our friend, Mr. Odgers, who has come over from England to give us the benefit of his able and efficient services, will speak of us as he has found us, and will be able to say whether we are the tyrannical, dogmatical, inquisitorial oppressors of mankind, which we are represented to be by some of the prints that are looked upon as the guides of public opinion in his country. He will be able to say whether there was any restriction put on him in reference to his discourses yesterday, and I can assure him there is no greater restriction placed on any minister of the Unitarian body in Ireland. We stand on the foundation of the Gospel. There we take our stand, and we believe that foundation is large enough to afford standing-room for any one who desires sincerely that the Christian religion should make progress in the world. We abjure all creeds and confessions—all articles of faith devised by fallible men on fallible authority; we reject human authority in all its forms, and stand on the same footing as the illustrious Presbyterian denomination in England—now the Unitarian denomination—and we are determined never to invade the rights of conscience. These are our principles; and these are the principles on which Mr. Odgers has been invited into our pulpits. I believe there is a good deal of misconception on this point, and, therefore, I have made these

remarks; but I must not further take up your time. I shall, therefore, call upon my friend, Mr. M'Alester, to read the Committee's report.

Rev. C. J. M'ALESTER read the report for the past year, from which we take the following extracts:—

"While the book department has received the attention of your Committee, and every new work published, whether in these countries or in America, which seemed to be of a suitable kind, has been promptly added to the catalogue, care has been taken to keep up a supply of tracts in explanation and defence of Unitarian Christianity. For this purpose, various tracts which had been exhausted have been reprinted, and new ones have been added. The collection of tracts now in stock, which have been published by this Society, embraces treatises on the leading points in dispute between Trinitarians and Unitarians, and presents in a small compass a complete vindication of our simple faith; so that, while the question—'What is Unitarianism?' has been answered at much length, and with great ability in the works of Yates and Porter, Peabody, Eliot, and others, we have, in many of our tracts, within the limits of a few pages, an answer to the same question, better suited for those who have neither money to purchase nor time to peruse more elaborate treatises. In the course of the year only one minister from your Society has visited Girvan. The Rev. J. Scott Porter preached there on the last Sunday in July. He reports that the attendance both at the morning and evening service was as large as in present circumstances could have been expected; and your Committee have reason to know that the members of the Congregation feel gratified and encouraged by the visits of ministers sent by this Society. It was intended that another minister should visit them before the winter set in, but circumstances arose to prevent this intention from being carried out, and arrangements have now been made for a minister to supply their pulpit early in June. It is in contemplation to afford further aid to the Girvan Congregation by prevailing on Mr. Peter Callender, a most worthy and earnest lay preacher, who has for many years, with unflagging zeal, ministered to the small band of Christian Unitarians in Paisley, to visit them occasionally at the expense of this Society. This arrangement Mr. Callender will aid in carrying out, should health permit him to do so. Tracts have been freely given to parties applying for them, and a considerable quantity has been sold, while grants of books and tracts have been made to several ministers, including books to the amount of two pounds, to the Rev. J. C. Woods for the library of the Adelaide Unitarian Congregation. *The Christian Unitarian* continues to be issued monthly, under the auspices of the Society, although the Society's funds have not been employed in its publication. It is now in its fourth year, and, it is hoped, has materially aided to maintain those principles which your Society was established to support."

MICHAEL ANDREWS, Esq., read the Treasurer's statement of accounts.

Mr. T. B. JOHNSON moved the adoption of the report, and, in a few remarks, pressed the claims of the Society to the more liberal

support of the Church. Mr. KENNEDY seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

The Rev. J. A. CROZIER moved the following resolution:—"That, in our mind, a belief in the Fatherhood of God and the Divine mission of his son Jesus Christ, lies at the foundation of true religion; and, while we do not presume to condemn our fellow-men, however widely they dissent from these principles, we regard it as our sacred duty openly to profess them, and earnestly to labour for their extension." He referred at considerable length to the great and important changes which are taking place in nearly every Christian church of the world. In the Established Church thought was becoming free, and even in that intensely orthodox Church—the Church of Scotland—liberal Christian principles were making themselves apparent; and they had still greater cause to thank God for the progress these principles were making in America. On every side they saw them taking root, but nowhere more than in that great and mighty land which would be, he believed, before long one of the greatest and most Christian empires on the face of the earth. But, to come back towards home and take a glance at the Presbyterian Church of this land—he was reading a report of a meeting of the Synod of Belfast the other day, and he found, in the course of a discussion on a question in which a minister was accused of teaching something contrary to the Westminster Confession, that one of the distinguished professors of that Church drew a marked distinction between the clergyman who made the charge, and the one against whom it was made—saying that the one was an "intensely orthodox man," and the other a "truly Christian man." This created some laughter; but the eminent man who stands at the head of that Church seemed to think that the distinction should be listened to with seriousness. By the distinction which was made by that professor, while an intensely orthodox man might be a Christian, a man might be truly Christian without being orthodox. Now, adding to all these things, the fact of so many of the ministers of that Church protesting against the professors of their new colleges being called on to sign the Westminster Confession of Faith, there was abundant evidence that freedom of judgment and opinion was spreading more and more over the world; and if they laboured, and other Churches entered into their labours, they should bless God, who had given them the victory through their Lord Jesus Christ.

Mr. WILLIAM SPACKMAN, in an able speech, seconded the adoption of the resolution, which was put from the chair, and passed unanimously.

Mr. M. ANDREWS moved a vote of thanks to the Rev. Mr. Odgers, of Bath, for the able, faithful, and impressive sermons which he delivered on the previous day in the Churches of the First and Second Congregation.

Mr. JAMES COLEMAN seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

The Rev. W. J. ODGERS, said—I beg to thank you and your Committee most sincerely, and especially my valued friend, Mr. Andrews, for the pleasure of being here to-day; and I feel greatly

obliged to the Chairman, for the very kind manner in which he has referred to me. Many recollections of my early days are recalled by my meeting him here, for when I was a student in London, Mr Porter was minister of Carter Lane Chapel. I had hoped also to have the pleasure of meeting Dr. Montgomery. I very much regret to hear that illness is the cause of his absence; but I trust that his valuable life will yet be spared for years to come. The Chairman has been pleased to speak in terms of warm approval of my services yesterday. I am thankful if I have been able in any way to aid the objects of your Society; and I am always glad if I can say a word in support of that faith, which I believe to be most honourable to God, and most beneficial to man. While so much ignorance and error—so much scepticism and infidelity prevail around us, I believe that it is an important part of our mission, as Unitarian Christians, to make it known and I felt that there may be religion without superstition—piety without cant—that there is a faith,—a Christian faith,—which does not bind the intellect in fetters, but gives it perfect freedom—a faith that is as far removed from superstition and blind fanaticism on the one hand, as it is from chilling infidelity on the other,—a faith based on evidence, in harmony with the teachings of reason, and nature, and providence—a faith which tends to purify the heart, to kindle and maintain the holiest affections, and impart the most abundant consolations. I fear, my friends, that we are not as deeply sensible as we should be of the importance of the work which God has given us to do,—that we fail to consider the extent of the benefit which we may be the means of communicating, if we are but earnest, zealous, and persevering in the cause of divine truth. If we really believe that we have a purer faith than that which is commonly professed by other churches (and if we do not believe this, then why do we dissent from them?) —if we believe those views of the Gospel which we are privileged to entertain, are adapted to remove the doubts, and to answer the objections of many, who now stand aloof from all Christian churches,—then it seems to me that no words are sufficiently strong to express the obligation resting upon us to labour in season and out of season, for the wider dissemination of those views. We believe that the hearty reception of our faith would be an unspeakable blessing to millions of human minds. We know that that faith is now, to a very large extent, misunderstood and condemned, notwithstanding all that has been said, and written, and published in its defence. And if sympathy with the *physical* wants of those around us will readily warm our hearts and open our hands for their relief; then should their mental and moral wants make a still more earnest appeal to our sympathy, and excite us to yet more persevering endeavours. Think how many there are in every large town whom no religious influence appears to have reached,—perhaps, because religion has never yet been presented to them in the form best adapted to attract their attention and to win their reverence. Let us try whether religion, as we have learned it, may not more effectually meet their wants, remove their doubts, and win their gratitude. My friends, when I think of what our holy faith is, and of the blessed efforts which I know that

it has produced, it seems to me to be an inestimable privilege to say or do anything for its wider dissemination. In conclusion, Mr. Odgers referred more particularly to the power of the press, and the benefits resulting from the extensive circulation of Unitarian books and tracts.

It was unanimously resolved that Michael Andrews, Esq., be requested to attend as a deputation at the approaching meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Society, in London, in Whitsun week.

A vote of thanks was passed to the Secretary and Treasurer, and they were requested to continue their services for another year.

On the motion of the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, seconded by Mr. Spackman, a vote of thanks was passed to the chairman. The benediction was then pronounced, and the proceedings terminated.

MANCHESTER DOMESTIC MISSION.

On Monday evening, May 15, the annual meeting of this mission was held in Lower Mosley Street School-rooms. After tea, H. J. Lippoc, Esq., took the chair, and spoke at some length on the objects of the mission. Mr. R. D. Darbishire read the Treasurer's statement of accounts for the year; and the missionaries, the Rev. J. Harrop and the Rev. S. Robinson, gave a report of their labours. Resolutions were passed adopting the several reports, and directing that they should be printed for distribution,—also declaring the undiminished confidence of the meeting in the Domestic Mission, and conveying to the missionaries their sympathy with them in their arduous and trying labours. Officers for the next year were appointed, and the meeting terminated.

OBITUARY.

Died, on April 29, at Ballydavoy, Holywood, Mr. Alexander Gibson, aged 71 years.

Died, on May 21, Edmund Thomas, youngest son of the Rev. T. Bowring, Mission House, Stanhope Street, Belfast, aged 18 years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] JULY, 1865. [No. 6.

WHAT IS UNITARIANISM?

To this question—What is Unitarianism?—there would, till recently, have been but one clear and distinct answer given, whether in England, Ireland, or America. All agreed in regarding it as that interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures which presents God as One Being in One Person, in contradistinction to those who believe that He subsists in Three Persons,—and as a Father, in opposition to the Calvinistic theology, which exhibits Him in a most unfatherly character,—which presents Christ as the Son of God, divinely appointed to be the Saviour of men, and which considers the future life to be a scene of retribution. Varieties of opinion, we know, there always have been among Unitarians, arising naturally from the freedom which they exercised, and from the absence of those creeds that fetter the members of other churches,—but in a firm faith in Divine Revelation, and in such an interpretation of it as we have indicated, they were completely agreed. Had any one accused them of denying the authority of Revealed Religion, they would have indignantly repelled the charge,—and they might have pointed to the writings of some of their leading minds in defence of Revelation, as the most satisfactory answer to so unjust an accusation. Indeed we remember, not many years ago, a charge of this nature having been preferred by some Calvinistic divine in Manchester against the English Unitarians, and the able answer and indignant rebuke which he received from an English Unitarian minister, referred with much force to treatises which Unitarians had written in defence of the truth of Christianity, and the genuineness of its sacred records. It is

only within the last few years that other opinions have been put forth as Unitarian. Some, availing themselves of the freedom which our Church has ever guarded as a sacred trust, have impugned Revelation, disparaged Christ, represented the narratives of his life as "fairy tales," and scoffed at his resurrection,—and they have claimed the right to call themselves Unitarians, to exercise the functions of the ministry in Unitarian pulpits, and to join with their brethren who in doctrine are Christian, in missionary efforts for the spread of religious truth. That such opinions could be broached in Unitarian pulpits and Unitarian periodicals without bringing down upon them general condemnation, can only be explained by the supposition that many had become indifferent to Christian truth, or had embraced sceptical views, and had allowed an abstract idea of liberty to supplant Christ in their minds. Hence the absurd view of Church organization which has become so fashionable. It must be based we are told, on *absolute religious liberty*,—that is, liberty for men to be Christians, Deists, Heathens, Atheists, anything or nothing,—and yet, members and ministers of one church! Such is the silly and absurd theory which has crept into the Unitarian denomination; and some otherwise intelligent and clearheaded men have begun to think that Unitarianism simply signifies *union among those that differ!*

If there is a Church, as distinguished from other Churches, whether it be Christian or not, it must have some fundamental principles which the members shall hold in common, and those who do not hold them are of necessity excluded,—that is, there must be some test. We use the word "test" here, as we might use the word "creed," not in that objectionable sense in which those terms have expressed instruments of tyranny and oppression, but as embodying the views in which those who agree are united. To say, then, there is no limit to variety of opinion within the Unitarian Church, is practically absurd. Let us suppose, for a moment, that Divine Revelation, to serve the liberty-lover and Christ-hater, is thrown overboard,—still there must be a restriction. Those cannot be admitted who do not believe in a God, for the organization is professedly for worship,—and if

an Atheist should join the Church, and aspire to be a teacher, there would be the anomalous feature of a minister, like some of the securalist lecturers, denying the existence of God! But let us suppose that some one joins the Church, who holds Trinitarian opinions. These advocates of freedom would most probably soon discover that their Church was Unitarian, and therefore no Trinitarian could be admitted, at least to their pulpits. It is wonderful how indulgent of variety of opinion our advocates of "free inquiry" are in one direction, and how hostile to such freedom in the opposite.

There must, in every Church, be some test—What shall it be? Goodness?—That would do very well as a practical test, but it would not be sufficient as a basis for religious belief. Shall we make a belief in one God the test? It would do very well for some who believe little or nothing more; but those who have heartily embraced the Christian faith will not be satisfied with less than its acceptance, and they will not understand the liberty that makes the Christian faith "an open question." An acknowledgment of the Christian faith, or, in other words, a belief in Divine Revelation, is the simplest basis that we can conceive of a Christian Church,—it is the one which our Saviour has himself given, and the one which the Apostles laid down as the foundation of faith and practice among the primitive disciples.

We have been often saddened at the wild ideas of liberty which have been advocated by many Unitarians in England, whose previous history led us to suppose that all the while they were themselves sincere and earnest believers in a Divine Revelation. We have particularly regretted that the two weekly journals of the denomination, lacking affection for each other, Herod and Pilate like, were heartily one in ignoring a faith in the Divine Mission of Christ as a qualification for the ministry in the Unitarian Church; and we have not failed to expose their errors and rebuke their inconsistency. We are glad to see in *The Herald* symptoms of an improvement. It may be, that the excess to which some ran has opened its eyes to the destructive tendency of the views it has for several years advocated. Be that as it may, it has published as its leader, in a late number, an

article, entitled—"The Unitarian Position and Work," from which the following are extracts :—

"The position of our church embraces a negative and a positive work. In relation to the first, time was when that consisted mainly in denying the validity of orthodox interpretations of the Scriptures. Now, however, it is widened. The Unitarian Church has not only to protest against the extraordinary assumptions of the popular creeds, but it has also to protest against the sweeping deductions of a rabid rationalism which, under the guise of scientific criticism, appears anxious to destroy the historic elements of our faith and so present us with a gospel which is the insignificant result of its own hypothetical reasonings. Divine truth, of course, has nothing to fear from evangelical errors on the one side, or rationalistic subtleties on the other. *Magna est veritas et prævalebit.* But it is right that the truth should be defended by human instrumentality as by the invisible means of God's Providence. The negative work of the Unitarian Church is, then, first, to deny the irrational pretensions of the orthodox dogmas. Orthodoxy is not a shadow, as some would have us believe, rapidly disappearing before the light of modern investigation, but a living power, exercising, amid much good, a baneful influence upon true religious progress. Against orthodoxy, which, however modified, retains its old spirit of intolerance and bigotry, Unitarianism, with its free instincts and enlightened interpretations of the Bible, has yet to contend, without any hope of parley, much less of alliance. Secondly, the Unitarian Church has, negatively, to defend historical Christianity from the attacks of a ruthless, dogmatic criticism, which reverences not its sublime verities—from the romancings of a Renan, the mythic theories of a Strauss, or the unvarying legalism and absolute conditions of theistic assumption.

"The positive work of our church is the maintenance of Christianity as a divine revelation given through Jesus Christ, and contained in the Bible. It is the assertion of the simply unity and fatherhood of God, the Messiahship of Christ, and the free gift of salvation to all who repent, as the cardinal principles of the Gospel. It is the interpretation of the facts of life by that revelation, and the application of it to human needs. Opposed to orthodox errors on the one hand, and to rationalistic extremes on the other, the Unitarian Church stands in the midst as the bulwark of divinely-revealed truth. It takes its position upon the historical facts of the Gospel; it is based upon the Christ of the Scriptures. When it departs from these, it is false to the very conditions of its existence. It is its work to elucidate the Biblical records by the light of modern science and the investigations of modern research. Its function is to ascertain, as far as possible, the credibility and authenticity of the Scriptures, especially the New Testament. That function comprehends the careful sifting of doubtful portions of Holy Writ from the undoubted, and the adoption of scientific modes of interpretation in accordance with the spirit of the records and the requirements of the present day. But the faith of the Unitarian Church is historical in its basis, and it is no longer true to itself

when it rejects this fundamental element. From the Scriptures it obtains its essential doctrines. . . . Whatever distinctions there may be among us, there is a definite fundamental position—a position which is of the utmost importance in relation to the religious problems of to-day. Freedom of thought alone is not the bond which unites the Unitarians of England into a church, but freedom of thought in connection with Christianity as a divine revelation historically received.

"The position, then, of the Unitarian Church is that of the vindicator of Christianity from orthodox misrepresentations on the one hand and theistic assumptions on the other. Ready to welcome every new truth, to modify its own theories by the progress of thought, it is the defender and promoter of the faith of Jesus as recorded in the Scriptures."

The foregoing extracts exhibit an altered tone in *The Herald*, at which we heartily rejoice. It matters not that for advocating the same views we have been denounced in its columns as bigoted and intolerant; we forget the past in our gratification at its present views. We trust it may yet be as earnest for Revelation as it has been for Rationalism and Parkerism; then we may entertain reasonable hopes that the missionary zeal which prevails in the North of England, and which *The Herald* largely directs, may do much for the spread of Christian Unitarianism in the populous manufacturing districts, where scepticism and secularism have become so wide-spread.

It is not to be wondered at that against such views as we have quoted some of the "advanced" brethren should enter a protest; and accordingly we find the Rev. W. Binns, whose honesty and candour we have always admired, however offensive the scepticism he inculcates, writing a lengthened letter, in which he opposes the Christian views of *The Herald*, and argues for absolute freedom of opinion. We have room only for the following extract:—

"Let it be granted that the majority of Unitarians would gladly echo your sentiments, and rejoice to see them so forcibly stated, still you must admit there is a large minority who would reject them. If we are ever to define Unitarianism, let us define it by points on which we are agreed, and not by points on which we differ. The word itself just means unity, and belief in it. I can accept this both as stating the unity of God and the possibility of unity of spirit in the midst of diversity of thought. But even this definition had better remain an inference than be drawn out into its full proportions, and thrust upon the Church as essential."

Mr. Binns, in his letter, states that if *The Herald* were to offer its creed (for so he characterises the Christian principles which the article in *The Herald* advocates) to the Lancashire and Cheshire Provincial Assembly as a statement of denominational faith, "it would be indignantly rejected even by men who might be willing enough to state their own personal faith in the same way." Accordingly, a minister who had been many years a member of that Assembly—the Rev. John Cropper—writes a letter to *The Herald*, in which he says:—

"If it be true that the Lancashire and Cheshire Provincial Association would, in its representative character, 'indignantly reject as our denominational faith Christian Unitarianism, taking its position upon the historical facts of the Gospel, and based upon the Christ of the Scriptures,' then I shall regard it as an imperative duty to myself and others, hereafter to absent myself from the meetings of the Assembly, and to decline all duties in its behalf which might otherwise devolve upon me. Leaving every other member of the Assembly to act and think upon the matter as he may deem best, I take that course for myself which appears indispensable for the honesty of my religious position as a sincere believer in the doctrines of Christian Unitarianism."

Almost coincident with this moving of the waters in the North of England is a similar agitation in the British and Foreign Unitarian Association in London. At the annual meeting of that body, held on the 7th ult., the Rev. Samuel Bache proposed a resolution, the precise terms of which will be found in our Intelligence department, in which it is declared that the terms "Christ," "Christian," and "Christianity," have been employed by some Unitarian writers, and in some Unitarian publications, as consistent with the implied or avowed repudiation of the Divine origin and authority of the Christian Revelation, and that the committee be instructed to take measures for the removal of such ambiguity, and clearly express the principles and objects of the Association. The introduction of such a resolution provoked a warm discussion, not on the merits of the question, but on points of order; it was seconded by the Rev. Thomas Madge; but, at the suggestion of the chairman, it was altered by Mr. Bache into a notice of motion to be brought forward at next annual meeting. *The Inquirer* criticises with much impatience the course which Mr. Bache has

thought right to take,—presumptuously puts forward its own opinions on the question as so many "*axioms*,"—and declares that the Unitarians must be "*free,—devoutly gravely, and religiously free* (!)—and if they cannot be so within the Association, they will either form a new one, or break the old one into pieces." If a Christian Association will not consent to receive into its ranks those who scoff at Revelation, and will not endorse their lax opinions, these advocates of the right of private judgment will do their best to destroy the organisation. Such is the toleration of those in whose mind all who cannot adopt their views are either fools or bigots.

THE ETERNAL GOODNESS.

O Friends! with whom my feet have trod
The quiet aisles of prayer,
Glad witness to your zeal for God
And love of men I bear.

I trace your lines of argument;
Your logic linked and strong
I weigh as one who dreads dissent,
And fears a doubt as wrong.

But still my human hands are weak
To hold your iron creeds;
Against the words ye bid me speak
My heart within me pleads.

Who fathoms the Eternal Thought?
Who talks of scheme and plan?
The Lord is God! He needeth not
The poor device of man.

I walk with bare hushed feet the ground
Ye tread with boldness shod;
I dare not fix with mete and bound
The love and power of God.

Ye praise his justice; even such
His pitying love I deem;
Ye seek a king; I fain would touch
The robe that hath no seam.

Ye see the curse which overbroods
A world of pain and loss;
I hear our Lord's beatitudes
And prayer upon the cross.

More than your schoolmen teach, within
Myself, alas! I know;
Too dark ye cannot paint the sin,
Too small the merit show.

I bow my forehead to the dust,
I veil my eyes for shame,
And urge, in trembling self-distrust,
A prayer without a claim.

I see the wrong that round me lies,
I feel the guilt within;
I hear, with groans and travail-cries,
The world confess its sin.

Yet in the maddening maze of things,
And tossed by storm and flood,
To one fixed star my spirit clings,—
I know that God is good!

Not mine to look when cherubim
And seraphs may not see,
But nothing can be good in Him
Which evil is in me.

The wrong that pains my soul below
I dare not throne above;
I know not of his hate—I know
His goodness and his love.

I dimly guess from blessings known,
Of greater out of sight,
And, with the chastened Psalmist, own
His judgments too are right.

I long for household voices gone,
For vanished smiles I long,
But God hath led my dear ones on,
And he can do no wrong.

I know not what the future hath
Of marvel or surprise,
Assured alone that life and death
His mercy underlies.

And if my heart and flesh are weak
To bear an untried pain,
The bruised reed He will not break,
But strengthen and sustain.

No offering of my own I have,
Nor works my faith to prove;
I can but give the gifts He gave,
And plead his love for love.

And so beside the Silent Sea
I wait the muffled oar;
No harm from Him can come to me
On ocean or on shore.

I know not where his islands lift
Their fronted palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond his love and care.

O brothers! if my faith is vain,
If hopes like these betray,
Pray for me that my feet may gain
The sure and safer way.

And Thou, O Lord! by whom are seen
Thy creatures as they be,
Forgive me if too close I lean
My human heart to the Thee!

WHITTIER.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.*

(*Continued from p.* 155.)

The 2nd Minister, John Campbell (1675 to 1714) is so set down, for reasons already stated in a note to p. 115 of this memoir; but owing to circumstances which also are detailed at the same place, it is unfortunately not in my power to give any authentic particulars connected with the settlement of this minister in Cairncastle, nor can I say anything respecting his previous personal history, except that he seems to have been evidently a native of Scotland.

* Since last month's paper was printed I have ascertained that from relying too implicitly on the authority of Dr. Reid, the historian of the Irish Presbyterian Church, and Mr. M'Skimmin, the historian of Carrickfergus, I have been led into error with respect to the descent and descendants of Rev. P. Adair, the first minister of Cairncastle. 1st. Mr. Adair does not appear to have been, as Reid (i. 206, ii. 124) conjectures, and as I, following Reid, said at p. 117 of this memoir, the son of Rev. W. Adair, the minister of Ayr, who administered the Solemn League and Covenant in Ulster in 1644. He seems to have been really the third son of John Adair of Genoch, and was married to Jean, second daughter of Sir Robert Adair of Ballymena; which derivation is corroborated by the fact that the crest on the tombstone of his son, Rev. W. Adair, in Antrim churchyard, is not the crest of the Kilhilt or Ballymena branch of the Adair family (to which William Adair of Ayr undoubtedly belonged), but is that of the Genoch branch of the same family. 2nd. Rev. P. Adair, minister of Carrickfergus, 1702—1717, was not the son of Rev. P. Adair, the first minister of Cairncastle, as M'Skimmin asserts in his History of Carrickfergus (pp. 178 and 378), and as I, following M'Skimmin, said at p. 154 of this memoir. He was really the son of William Adair of Corgie, who was first cousin to Sir Robert Adair of Ballymena, and his wife was Isabel Adair, daughter of Robert Adair, youngest son of Sir Robert Adair, and niece of Mrs. Patrick Adair of Cairncastle and Belfast. I make these corrections of my predecessors and myself on the indisputable authority of Rev. Dr. Reeves, the accomplished Irish antiquary, who, I am happy to say, is at present preparing a memoir of the Adair family, which will be anxiously expected by all who take an interest in such subjects, and who, in the meantime, has kindly furnished me with the foregoing information. To the same friendly correspondent I am indebted for the following extracts from a book published by the Maitland Club, entitled, "Monumenta Almæ Universitatis Glasguensis." The first entry refers to Rev. P. Adair of Cairncastle; and the second to Rev. P. Adair of Carrickfergus:—

"Nomina adolescentium Theologiæ studiosorum qui in Academia Glasquensi se gymnasiarchæ reliquisque Theologiæ Professoribus in disciplinam tradiderunt propria cujusque manu exarata, post Id. Dec. 1644. "Patricius Adair."

"Nomina discipulorum tertiæ classis sub præsidiæ Magistri Johannis Boyd qui hoc anno Academiam intrarunt. Feb. 10, 1691. "Patricius Adair."

His name first appears in the Old Minute Book on Feb. 6, 1683, that being the date of the first entry after the hiatus in the record ; and he is there set down as amongst the members who were present at the monthly meeting which was held on that day in Templepatrick. His attendance at these meetings appears to have been, for several years, tolerably regular, but I don't find anything worthy of notice mentioned with respect either to himself or his congregation, until we come to 1685, when he was Moderator of the meeting, and when an unsuccessful attempt was made by the congregation of Carnmoney to wile him away from Cairncastle. At the August meeting of that year, "John Campbell from Carnmoney shews the people's unanimity for calling Mr. John Campbell, but the meeting, considering it improbable that Mr. C. will answer their desire, appointed Mr. Douglass to supply them till next meeting." At the next meeting, which was in October, and at which Mr. Campbell himself was present, "George Russell and Matthew Johnston from Carnmoney desire to know what the meeting is doing with them, but they wanting a commission, and no formal address made, therefore the meeting can't determine anything at this time. They are to be supplied." Nothing eventually came of this movement.

Until 1687, the monthly meetings, from whose records we are now quoting, appear to have been meetings of *ministers* exclusively, held for mutual conference and deliberation on the affairs of the Church. Previously to the date which I have mentioned Elders do not seem to have been present at them. But in this year, and ever after, the meetings assume more of the character of a Presbytery. On Sep. 6, 1687, "it is unanimously agreed that ruling Elders be brought to next meeting;" and accordingly, in the minute of the October meeting, and all subsequent meetings, the names of several Elders are given as being present, in connexion with the congregations which they are stated to represent. The Elders who, between 1687 and 1691 (when the old Minute Book ends), attended the meetings "from Cairncastle," were John Callwell, John Allen, James Woodside, James Allen, William Fairie.

In the troublesome times of 1688–9, Mr. Campbell of

Cairncastle appears, like many other ministers similarly situated, to have retired to Scotland; and during his absence, provision was made, so far as possible, for the supply of his pulpit by the more faithful brethren who had the courage to remain in Ireland. But in 1690 the latter ministers seem to have thought that it was time for their more prudent associates to return to their charges in this country, and accordingly, on Feb. 26, 1690, it is stated:—"As for our Ireland ministers who are in Scotland, the brethren refer it to each meeting to consider what congregations in their bounds are in any tolerable case to maintain their ministers, and accordingly to write to them for their speedy return." In the case of Mr. Campbell, and his congregation of Cairncastle, there were some circumstances which for a time seemed likely to prevent their re-union. At the meeting of the brethren on April 1, 1690, Mr. Patrick Adair (the former minister of Cairncastle) "reported that he had a letter from Mr. Geo. Meldrum and Mr. Vernor, in name of the Presbytery of Irvine, shewing that Mr. John Campbell, minister of Cairncastle, hath now a call from the Parish of Newmills in Scotland, and desiring allowance from this meeting that he stay a while in their country, but that neither he nor the Presbytery will do anything without the consent of the ministers of Ireland. For answer to this letter, the meeting appoints Mr. Robert Henry, Carrickfergus, to write to Capt. Shaw of Ballygally, that he and the congregation of Cairncastle will consider what they can do for Mr. Campbell's encouragement among them, and that they advertise Mr. Hall, Larne, to assist them in that affair as need shall require, and that Mr. Henry write likewise to Mr. Hall to preach at Cairncastle, and assist them when called." Under these circumstances Mr. Campbell appears to have come ever to Cairncastle to examine for himself into the state of matters and his prospects there. On April 29, 1690, we read:—"Mr. John Campbell being returned from Scotland, but not being able to attend the meeting" (which was held at Belfast, as were several meetings about this time, in order to have the protection of the military authorities), "desires by a letter that some brethren may be appointed to go to Cairncastle, and consider the state of that congregation, and whether he may

probably live there. In answer to which, the meeting appoints Messrs. Thos. Hall, Larne, and John Haltridge of Islandmagee, to go, as Mr. Campbell and they shall agree on the time, and report of their diligence to the next meeeting." But nothing more is heard of Cairncastle until June 3, 1680, when Mr. Campbell was present at the meeting in Belfast, as was also Mr. George Buttle,* a commissioner from the congregation of Cairncastle. At the same meeting was also submitted a letter from Mr. Thos. Hall, Larne, who was at Cairncastle according to appointment, shewing that much of the arrears due to Mr. John Campbell was "desperate," but that there was about £18 got up already, and that the parish would oblige themselves, against Candlemas next, to pay up what further might be probable, which would be about £22. For that part of the arrears which they looked upon as desperate, Mr. Buttle declared that they were resolved to account for the year 1689 in lieu of that; and withal supplicated that Mr. C. might be continued among them. Mr. C. being now necessarily called to go to Scotland, the meeting declared that upon a satisfying view of their diligence, they would interfere with him to return and reside among them; and withal "appointed Mr. John Haltridge, Islandmagee, to go to Cairncastle, and preach there on Sabbath come fortnight, and on the Monday following to see and make report of that people's diligence." With that report, as made to the next meeting in July, 1690, the meeting was only "part satisfied;" and, at the request of John Allen and David Edmund, who appeared there and then as Commissioners from Cairncastle, Mr. William Adair, Ballyeaston, the son of their former minis-

* The Buttle family, upwards of 200 years ago, got fee-farm grants from the Earl of Antrim of lands and tenements both in Glenarm and Cairncastle, which were afterwards sold by them to the late Mr William Agnew of Kilwaughter, and are now part of the estate of Mr. James Agnew of Cairncastle Lodge. The Buttle family is now, I believe, locally extinct. The following is an abstract of the original grant to their ancestor:—"1637, Aug. 8.—Randal then Earl of Antrim, and Alexander Macdonnell, granted in fee farm to Randal Buthill, then of Glenarm, various lands therein described as one quarter and a half of land in Lissney (Lisnahay), one tenement and garden in Glenarm, wherein the said Randal Buthill did then or of late dwell, one corn mill, one tuck mill, and ten perch acres in Ballyreddie (Ballyrudder), the mill of Carnlough, and one half acre perch measure thereunto belonging, situate in the barony of Glenarm."

ter, and probably a native of their parish, was appointed to be with them one Sabbath before next meeting. But even *he* was not able to bring matters to a satisfactory issue between Mr. Campbell and his congregation of Cairncastle.

At the meeting on August 5, 1690, Mr. W. Adair reported that he had gone to Cairncastle as appointed, and written to Mr. John Campbell to return to his charge; to which Mr. Hall, Larne, had received Mr. C.'s answer, which was that he was not satisfied to return, as he looked upon that people's proposals as not sufficient. The meeting therefore appointed Mr. John Haltridge, Islandmagee, to go thither on Sabbath come fortnight, and Mr. Thomas Hall, Larne, to join with him on the Monday following (Mr. Haltridge preaching there also), to see how things stood, and if that people could be brought to allow a year's stipend in lieu of arrears due to Mr. C. The meeting also left it with these brethren to advise with Mr. George Buttle as to their going thither.

Mr. Hall, according to the report which he made to the next meeting on September 24, 1690, did go to Cairncastle, and although he was not accompanied by Mr. Haltridge, "who was not there, not being called," yet my venerable predecessor, even without any assistance, seems to have executed his commission well. "Having discoursed the session and gentlemen of Cairncastle, he found that there was a mistake between Mr. John Campbell and that people as to one half year only, and therefore he wrote to Mr. J. C. to pass over that matter. The meeting approved Mr. Hall's diligence, and expected Mr. J. C.'s answer thereto would supersede their meddling any further therein now. As for the letter of the Presbytery of Irvine, concerning Mr. C., they delayed any answer to it till Mr. C.'s answer came." But this answer does not appear to have arrived for a considerable time. Cairncastle was supplied by the brethren until March, 1691, when Mr. Adair reported that he had written as desired to Mr. Campbell, "who is returned," and who seems to have always preferred judging of his prospects in Cairncastle by a personal visit to the spot, rather than by correspondence. He did not attend the March meeting, and in his absence the brethren ordered an exchange

of pulpits between him and Mr. Hall, Larne, "for a day betwixt this and next meeting for the affairs of that place," *i.e.*, Cairncastle. But at this meeting in March appeared also other parties who had likewise something to say with respect to Mr. Campbell's return to Cairncastle. "From the Presbytery of Irvine in Scotland appeared commissionat Mr. Matthew Campbell of Walterhaughs, prosecuting the transportation of Mr. John Campbell from Cairncastle thither, and offering several reasons for it, as also a letter from the Earl of Loudon, and another from the Presbytery of Irvine, to this meeting, to the same effect." But Cairncastle was not to be thus robbed of its minister, even at the request of the Earl of Loudon. The meeting ordered their Clerk "to send a copy of the aforesaid papers and reasons to Mr. John Campbell, and to the people of Cairncastle, and to warn them that the matter would be congnosced upon next meeting." Accordingly at next meeting in April, when Mr. Campbell was present, Mr. Hall, Larne, having reported that "he had gone to Cairncastle, according to appointment, there appeared as Commissioner from that Congregation, Mr. Henry Shaw of Ballygally, giving an account that of £80 arrears in money and bonds, they hoped to bring it to 20 guineas, which also they hoped in process of time to get made up." But I am sorry to say that the minister, for whose return and continuance amongst them the Cairncastle people contended thus stoutly, did not reciprocate their kindness. He certainly evinced no corresponding alacrity for the re-union. I am inclined to think that he would rather not have come back to Cairncastle, but would have much preferred being allowed to stay in Scotland. At this meeting in April, 1691, he asked and obtained leave of the brethren "to go to Scotland for a short time." This alone might have excited suspicions with respect to his wishes and intentions; and certainly the suspicions would not be removed by the difficulty which was afterwards experienced in inducing him to return to his charge in Cairncastle, even after being written to several times and in the strongest terms to that effect, by authority of the meeting.

In the meantime the brethren proceeded to dispose of the pretensions of Loudon to the services of Mr. John

Campbell, and they did so in a manner which must have been gratifying to Cairncastle. "The reasons for the proposed transportation having been forwarded to the latter congregation, and Mr. Henry Shaw of Ballygally having produced answers thereto, as well as pressing for the continuance of their minister, Mr. John Campbell, amongst them, the meeting, taking into their serious consideration, and judging of this matter, and reasons *hinc inde*, and after calling on God for direction, went to a vote and were unanimously clear *not* to loose him from his present charge in Cairncastle, upon which there was given in by Mr. Matthew Campbell an appeal to the Synod." The Synod, however, approved of the meeting's determination concerning Mr. John Campbell's continuance in Cairncastle. But the difficulty was to get Mr. John Campbell himself to come back at all. Several letters were written to him "in the meeting's name to return to his charge with all convenient speed." On one occasion it is even stated "that the gentlemen and people of Cairncastle do declare that they are willing, upon Mr. Campbell's coming over, to pay up what arrears are due to him, and to give him security for the future." This was a tempting offer; but, strange to say, at the August meeting in 1691, "a letter from Mr. John Campbell shews that he is not satisfied that things are not further secured in that place" (Cairncastle), and at the ensuing meeting in September it is reported that "Mr. Hall wrote to Mr. Campbell, but hath received no answer."

How long matters continued in this state with respect to Mr. Campbell I cannot tell, as the old minute book of the Antrim meeting ends with Dec. 1691, and the next available volume does not begin until 1745. But it is certain that Mr. Campbell, whatever may have been the considerations which induced him to lay aside his ungracious reluctance to return to Ireland, did eventually come back to his charge in Cairncastle. In 1699, "Mr. John Campbell of Cairncastle," is mentioned in the session book of Larne and Kilwaughter (see *Christian Unitarian*, 1864, pp. 410—413) as promoting the settlement of Mr. Ogilvie in the latter congregation, and especially as suggesting the notable plan that the people of Larne and Kilwaughter should make sure of Mr. Ogilvie's favourable

reception of their call, and prevent the possibility of any other congregation supplanting them in his good graces "by forthwith buying a horse for him before next meeting." In 1701 Mr. Campbell was Moderator of the Synod which met in Belfast. In 1711 his name occurs several times in the narrative of the witch case in Islandmagee, to which I have alluded in previous memoirs; but beyond these incidental notices I have nothing further to record with respect to the second minister of Cairncastle, or that congregation while under his charge. In this romantic parish he probably ended his ministry and his life, shortly before June 14, 1715, that being the date of the ordination of his successor, Mr. William Taylor, who was the third minister of this congregation. As I have already stated, it is likely that Mr. Campbell, during his residence in Cairncastle, occupied the house which had been occupied by his predecessor, Mr. Patrick Adair, and which was also occupied by his successor, Mr. Taylor (see note to p. 154). Respecting Mr. Campbell's personal or family history I know nothing whatever. Local tradition, so far as I am aware, is silent on the subject. I cannot even tell whether he was ever married. If he were, and had descendants, they must have returned to Scotland (to which country the reader will have observed that Mr. Campbell himself was very well inclined to go back), for certainly there are no traces of them on this side of the water.

(*To be continued.*)

NARRATIVES FROM REAL LIFE.

MARY F——.

Old Mary F—— was one of my constant hearers. She was the poor afflicted woman whom William K—— so often visited for the purpose of reading the Bible to her. Dressed in a short faded old red cloak, and with her stick in her hand, old Mary was to be seen marching through the grave-yard or along the aisle of the meeting-house as regularly as the doors were opened for worship. Her constant seat was at the foot of the pulpit stairs, and

often she might be observed standing up, with her eyes fixed upon the minister, and one hand held to her ear to catch a few words. When disappointed, she would sit down, and with a long-drawn sigh, exclaim, "Can't hear!" So anxious was she to hear, that on one occasion I had her in the desk with me; and at the Monday evening services she generally stood by my side, with her ear pretty close to my mouth; but it was all useless. Still, however, she was very constant in her attendance. Nothing but illness caused her place to be empty. One day I said to her—"How is it, Mary, that infirm and deaf as you are, you, nevertheless, attend so constantly?" She replied—"Why, Sir, this, you know, is God's house; and it is the place where, according to his own promise, he will especially bless his people; so that, by coming here, I put myself in the way of getting a blessing. I am now eighty and six years old: I am poor and deaf, and almost blind, and my tottering limbs will scarcely carry me along; but God *knows* all this; and, though I cannot *hear*, I can *think*; and who knows? perhaps when I am here, and I think upon God, God will be pleased to think upon me. When I am sitting on the pulpit stairs, I say to myself, Oh, how right glad I should be to pick up a word or two,—and then I turn aside my bonnet and cap, but it is no good. So I then look around the chapel, and think to myself—here God has often met with many who have come to worship, and here he will meet with many more,—and why not poor old Mary among them, for he won't pass her by, just because she happens to be very deaf. Besides I come because an old woman's example in coming regularly may, perhaps, be the means of inducing the younger ones to come." Such were old Mary's reasons for her regular attendance; and she was constantly to be seen in her place until within a week of her death.

One Sunday morning I observed a boy standing at the meeting-house door at the commencement of the seven o'clock service. "Sir," said he, "old Mary F—— has sent me to ask you to come and see her immediately." I said, "I will go between this and the eleven o'clock services." He soon returned to say, "I must please to come then, or I should not see her alive." I went immediately, and

found the poor old creature struggling in death. "Oh my dear," said she, "I am glad you are come, for I am fast going home, and I want you to pray with me once more before I go. But dying is hard work!" "Mary," said I, "God is with you, and he will carry you safely through this last trial." "Oh yes," said she, "he has been with me eighty and six years, and he won't leave me *now*." I, with several of the friends who had been at the early meeting, prayed with her, and bid her farewell until we should meet in heaven. Before I left, she desired I would pray for her peaceful dissolution in the eleven o'clock service. I did so, and ere that service was concluded, she departed to her rest.

Mr. H——, myself, and several friends belonging to the congregation attended her remains to the grave. We all respected her for her simplicity and piety; in her was exemplified the comforting promise which our heavenly Father has given to his aged servants, Isaiah xlvi. 4—"Even to your old age I am he; and even to hoary hairs will I carry you." Though dead, old Mary's example of constant attendance is well remembered by many, nor will it soon be forgotton.

MRS. D——.

On Monday week, as I was entering the chapel for evening service, I overtook one of our most regular attendants, old Mrs. D——. "What," said I, "have you ventured out this dark stormy night?" "Yes, Sir," said she, "and for this reason,—because I could not stay at home. I find so much comfort at the meetings for prayer that I could not miss one of them on any account. But, Sir, I have been thinking much to-day, and as I came here this evening, whether, as I am now in my eightieth year, I have so much to do with *prayer* as I have with *praise*. God has blessed me with so many mercies throughout my long life, that I have been thinking whether the remainder of it ought not to be entirely spent in *thanksgiving*, and whether I ought not to leave other matters and all coming events completely with himself." I advised her to *thank* God and *pray* to him too. (1848. ten years after the foregoing conversation). Mrs. D——

has long since been dead. She was a woman of strong mind, and industrious habits, and kept a dame school until within two days of her death. Her trials were numerous; but her faith and hope in God were firm, and she enjoyed peace at the last. She was buried by moonlight. Her grave may be seen near the pathway leading to the house of prayer she so regularly attended and so truly loved. A small stone marks the spot, bearing this inscription,—"Mary D——, 1838. 'An old disciple.'—Acts xxi. 16."

THOUGHTS ON THE FORM AND MANNER OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

(*Concluded from page* 162.)

In my former communication on this subject, after noticing the evils of which Dr. Lee complains, in his lately published work on the Reform of the Church of Scotland, and expressing my opinion that they do not, generally speaking, prevail in the celebration of public worship as it is conducted among the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland,—I admitted the existence of a danger against which it is incumbent upon every minister to be on his guard,—that of falling into an unvarying form of words, in his prayers on the Lord's Day, the constant use of which becomes wearisome to the hearers, and deprives the devotional part of the religious service of almost all its interest and value. The effect of this sameness in the minister's prayers, on the mind of the congregation, is much more painful than the constant use of a prescribed liturgy. In the latter case there is nothing that has the appearance of deception; the prayer-book is in everybody's hands, and there is no attempt at concealment. But among Presbyterians the practice of free prayer was originally adopted because it allowed scope for the spontaneous flowing forth of the pastor's devout feelings in unison with those of his people; and the disuse of any aid to the memory, whether written or printed, seems still

to insinuate that the language employed is the outpouring of the heart at the moment when it is uttered. And when, from the constant unvarying routine of the same prayers recurring Sunday after Sunday for years (and in some instances throughout the greater part of a life-time), it is perceived or believed that this is not the case,—the congregation are apt to imagine that something approaching very closely to deception is practised upon them; and *that*, in the discharge of a duty which, of all others, requires the utmost sincerity of soul. I need not add that in most cases, the hearers are wrong in supposing this. There is, in almost every case of the kind, no design or wish to create a false impression. The minister, when he stands up in the pulpit, and calls on his flock to unite with him in prayer, does really endeavour to express his devotional feelings in the words which suggest themselves at the time; but the topics for prayer are necessarily pretty much the same at all times, and unconsciously the expression of the same thoughts shapes itself into the same form of words. These words, by frequent repetition, become so impressed upon the memory that they rise spontaneously to the lips, even when the minister is striving to extemporize his language, and perhaps thinks that he is doing so. In such cases the people are mistaken in supposing that their minister is endeavouring to make an old prayer, learned by note, pass for a new one; he is really trying to offer up a new one every Sunday, though from the force of habit and association, he recurs to the old familiar phrases which he has used for years. Still it cannot be denied that the moral effect on the mind of the hearers is bad: and every pastor who is concerned for the honour and usefulness of his ministrations, will study to avoid the sameness which occasions it.

It could scarcely serve any good purpose to record many painful facts which could easily be mentioned, to prove that this is no chimerical danger. Many congregations have ground for complaint on this score, and some have suffered loss of members in consequence. In others, the minister's usefulness has been seriously impaired. Occasionally the cause of religion has been injured. Enough has been said to shew the existence of

the danger, and the great importance of guarding against it.

Dr. Lee would apply a remedy to this and other evils in the celebration of divine worship, as conducted in the Church of Scotland, by the publication and use of an authorized Book of Common Prayer. I need not recapitulate the obvious objections to such a measure, if proposed for adoption among Non-Subscribing Presbyterians. It seems to me that the same end could be quite as effectually attained by the general use of written forms of prayer,—composed or compiled by each minister for his own use,—which need not be committed to memory. They might be taken into the pulpit and read, with as little attempt at concealment as our sermons or other addresses. As these forms could be read over in the study, and carefully compared with each other, the tediousness and disgust produced by the constant repetition of the same unvarying words and phrases could easily be avoided. A much greater variety not only in the language of the prayers, but in their substance, could be secured, and many other inconveniences could be obviated, of which it may be well to mention a few.

Among these is the unreasonable and preposterous length to which some ministers occasionally allow themselves to run on in their extemporaneous prayers. I have more than once been constrained to stand while a preacher was praying, in my name, for three quarters of an hour. For more than two-thirds of the time, I had lost all distinct conception of what he was saying; yet I cannot say that I was not engaged in prayer; but my prayer was a mental one: "*Oh, that this were done!*" But here, as in the former instance, I believe the minister offended unconsciously: he really was not aware that he had fatigued and exhausted every mind in the assemblage before him; perhaps he scarcely knew how many minutes he had kept the people on their legs. If, however, he had written his prayer and read it, the number of pages would have reminded him of the length to which he would extend; and common sense would have led him to see that no human attention could be sustained in such an exercise as prayer for the time required in the case of so lengthened an address to the Deity.

A third evil against which a written form of prayer would afford a safe-guard, is the stumbling, hesitating, and boggling way of speaking into which some of our brethren fall, now and then, when they are trusting to the impulse of the moment for words in which to clothe their thoughts; or, it may be, for thoughts to utter in words. It is not every man who has so much command of language, and such a flow of ideas, that he can carry on a connected series of sentences for a considerable length of time, without preparation beforehand; and when he essays to do so, and is unable to do it right, his uncertainty is sure to make itself felt by the hearer, who is thereby kept in constant alarm lest his minister should stick fast in the midst of his prayer:—a state of mind in which it is scarcely possible to experience any devotional fervour. But the same man might be, and probably would be, able to compose a very excellent form of prayer in the tranquillity of his closet; and if he brought it with him into the pulpit, and read it in a suitable manner as the incense of the sanctuary, he would be in no danger of falling into the awkward and unbecoming habit of a hesitating and stammering utterance in prayer.

I cannot but observe that Dr. Lee's book is throughout characterised by a strong leaning to *ritualism*. Non-essential forms, which are by Presbyterians properly regarded and treated as things indifferent,—because they are so left in the New Testament,—he would manifestly wish to regulate by law. For example; it is, in all our congregations, a matter which is left optional whether the hearers shall stand or kneel at prayer: he would enjoin the use of the kneeling posture. It is unnecessary for me to say that I have no scruple against kneeling; I always kneel at family and other prayer in my dwelling-house, and so, I suppose, do most of my brethren. But to require a congregation to kneel, if they prefer standing, —neither posture being essential to the act of praying "in spirit and in truth,"—seems to me an unwarrantable assumption of authority. In point of fact *the practice of kneeling is fast dying out*, even in the Church of England whose rubrick enjoins it. There is scarcely a congregation from Berwick to Dover in which the people do not *sit* during prayer:—they bow the head a little, and per-

haps they may bend one of their knees somewhat;—but still they are not kneeling but sitting in their pews; in the very face of the direction in the prayer-book, which orders them to kneel. The same is the case in all the Unitarian Congregations which use liturgical forms, so far as I am aware, without any exception:—and the same, I have reason to believe, is the case in the Church of Greyfriars, Edinburgh, where Dr. Lee himself preaches. Now whatever arguments may be urged in favour of the practice of kneeling at prayer, no one will maintain that *sitting* is either a scriptural or a becoming posture for persons engaged in such an exercise; and yet experience shews that to enjoin kneeling is really to introduce the practice of sitting.

Another point which the learned doctor would evidently insist upon, if he could expect to carry it, is the utterance by the people of oral responses to the prayers read by the clergyman. But here also he has failed in carrying his own congregation with him. We think it will be allowed by any candid observer, that the responsive part of the Church of England's liturgy is an utter failure. In cathedrals and collegiate churches,—where the whole service from beginning to end is set to music,—the responses are, of course, sung by the choir; but never, except in the Church of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, have I heard the congregation attempt to join in singing them. In most parish churches and chapels of ease, the responses are read by a clerk, who is employed to utter them in the name and as the representative of the people. This is not agreeable to the rubrick, nor to the intention of those who compiled the prayer-book. In some churches, the people, or some of them, do make an effort, or rather a shew of joining in the responses. But the effort has always struck me as an abortive one. Instead of giving out their responses in a clear, firm tone,—the voice of each individual being as distinct as that of the clergyman,—and altogether far more powerful than his,—the people say them in a whisper or a half-whisper, and all that is heard is a sort of confused buzz going round the church, which leaves anything but a devotional effect on the mind. Is there any likelihood that the Presbyterians, who have never been used to utter responses in

public worship, will succeed better in the attempt than their brethren of the Church of England, in which the practice of responding has been enjoined by law for upwards of three centuries? We may test this by a simple fact. There is nothing to hinder our people from responding, if they are so disposed, to their minister's prayer, by the utterance of a solemn "*Amen!*" when it is concluded, or at the close of any of the petitions contained in it. But who ever heard any one of our congregations uttering even that simple response? And what reason is there to believe that they who do not respond by the utterance of one word, when it is left optional with them to utter it or not, could ever be brought to join devoutly and heartily in the many and various responses which are prescribed in the Order for Morning Prayer, in the Litany, and the Communion Service of the Prayer-Book, or in any other responses of the same kind, and constructed on the same principle?

On the whole, it is my opinion that the practice of *free prayer*, as contradistinguished from the use of prescribed forms, should not be abandoned among us, but that where it is deficient in any of the requisites for an exercise so solemn and important, the utmost care and study,—and, if necessary, a large amount of labour,—should be employed by ministers in improving it. The plan which I have recommended seems to me to have many advantages; but perhaps others may be suggested that would be equally or still more effectual for the end in view. For my own part, I intend to give mine a fair trial; if, after such a trial, I find that it produces inconveniences greater than those which it is intended to remedy, I shall abandon it without hesitation.

I have said so much on the subject of prayer, that I shall not trouble the readers of *The Christian Unitarian* with any remarks on the other parts of public worship. No doubt other correspondents will favour us with their ideas respecting them, if it appears at any time desirable to discuss them in this periodical.

E. F.

THE DISSENTING BODY IN TROWBRIDGE.

[From an article in a late number of *The London Review* on the state of religion in Trowbridge we make the following extract. to many of our readers it will possess much interest from its reference to the Conigree Chapel and its esteemed minister.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

The Dissenting body is numerous and powerful in Trowbridge. Several master millowners are Dissenters. Mr. Brown (Brown and Palmer), of the largest firm in the town, is a Dissenter. Of their seven chapels, five belong to the Baptists, one to the Wesleyans, and one to the Independents. One tone of doctrine is found in them all, with one exception—that of the Conigree chapel. Of this chapel we shall hereafter speak, for it has a singular history. Calvinism obtains here in shades lighter or darker, but all pretty strongly pronounced—for even the Wesleyan minister is said not to teach a bold and outspoken Arminianism, but one modified and toned down by the infusion of many grains of the predestinarian theory. Wesleyanism, however, is rather languid in Trowbridge. The bolder doctrine of the Baptists is preferred. That taught at Zion chapel is said to be Calvinism in its strongest and, one would think, its gloomiest form. We were assured by a minister of long standing in the town, that downright antinomianism is inculcated in this chapel. The congregation is about 500 in number, and have no settled minister, nor have they had one since the death of Mr. Warburton, who died eight years ago. Yet they keep well together, bound close in the bonds of antinomianism. We were assured that one reason why they have no permanent minister is that "they can get no one high enough and strong enough for them!" As a sample of their tone and feeling, we were told that "they think it wrong to teach children the Lord's Prayer"—for "how do we know that the child is not a vessel of wrath predestined to eternal damnation?" It is shocking to have to state such a fact, but it is nevertheless true—too true. Perhaps in the whole kingdom you would scarcely find a

parallel to the unflinching antinomianism of this congregation.

Of the practical effects of that doctrine we received a very startling statement from a highly respectable medical man of long standing in Trowbridge. He holds offices which prove that he enjoys the public confidence. He assured us that the Calvinistic doctrine so rife in Trowbridge, alike in church and chapel, is often attended with the most deplorable results, even to the production of lunacy. He put it in this shape—"The predestinarian doctrine taught here *costs the town* £400 *a year in lunacy!*" Such at least is the judgment of a very intelligent medical man, and one who has practised in Trowbridge for more than twenty years. It is a statement well worth pondering.

But as a foil to it, and as still more singular in another way, we may instance the Conigree Chapel which belongs to the General Baptists. It is an ancient foundation, dating from the Commonwealth. The name Conigree (pronounced Conniger) is of uncertain derivation; some derive it from *conies*—the old word for rabbits—and believe that its site was formerly a rabbit-warren; others derive the name from *könig*, or king, as it was formerly a royal manor. However, one small quarter of Trowbridge is called "the Conigree." There is a parsonage and a beautiful chapel, which all visitors to the town are requested to visit as the thing best worth seeing in it. The Rev. Samuel Martin has been the minister for forty-two years. His incumbency is a freehold, and hence he is immoveable. His doctrine, and that of a most attached and devoted congregation, is the direct antipodes of that taught at Zion chapel, and elsewhere dominant in the town. They offer divine worship to God the Father alone; they are indeed called Unitarians, but they hold a more exalted idea of our Lord than is commonly held by Unitarians. They are no believers in a vicarious atonement, nor in eternal punishment. They embrace the doctrine of universal restoration. But unquestionably their works are good. The congregation consists wholly of the working classes, yet the beautiful Gothic chapel in which they worship, and which was erected a few years ago, cost £2,000, though it is true that only £300 was raised in Trowbridge.

The members of the flock gave their labour for nothing; Mr. Martin himself laboured with his own hands in building it—with one and all it was a labour of love. They still keep it in repair, and the pretty surrounding graveyard in order, without charge. On entering the chapel one is struck with the general beauty of the design—with the noble pillars on each side with a space around each showing a clear base, and with the richly painted east window, the upper part of which is in the form of a wheel. One is surprised at such artistic beauty and attention to æsthetic effect in so humble a community of worshippers. At Easter the chapel is decorated with flowers and the arches covered with evergreens. It is remarkable that the Conigree chapel is a favourite place for marriages. Mr. Martin has married more couples than any other minister in the town. He and his flock are held in singular respect. Quaker, Jew, and Catholic all contributed to the building. There is a prayer-meeting an hour long, held every Sunday at 7 A.M., and at the same early hour in winter, in a room adjoining the chapel. Their Sunday-School numbers 200 scholars. We have again an instance of what the zeal of a pastor may effect, and we must admit its results, much as we deprecate the doctrine they are intended to promote.

LINES

WRITTEN ON THE OCCASION OF THE REFRESHING RAIN AFTER THE LATE HOT WEATHER.

Gathering clouds descend in rain
  Upon the thirsting earth;
Moisten mountain, vale, and plain,
The meadow land, and stunted grain,
  And wake them into mirth.

Hark! the drops fall soft and slow,
  And all the glowing flowers
Fold up their panting leaves, as though
They felt their beauty brighter grow
  Beneath the cooling showers.

Hear the chime the drops are ringing!
While the sunburnt grass
To itself a song is singing,
Of the joy the cloud is bringing,
As its shadows pass.

More gaily leaps the bubbling spring
Upon its verdant way;
More jocund goes each living thing,—
The birds and insects on the wing
All sing a roundelay.

My spirit feels the freshness of the hour;
There seems a heavenly balm
Diffused through nature with a healing power,
As if God's grace, descending in the shower,
Spread universal calm.

I. B. L. A.

June 23, 1865.

INTELLIGENCE.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The fortieth anniversary of this Association was held at Essex Street Chapel, Strand, on Wednesday morning, June 7th. The religious service was introduced by the Rev. T. E. Poynting, of Monton. Dr. G. Vance Smith, of York, delivered the sermon from the text, Heb. vi. 1. At the close of the religious services the business meeting was held, when the President of the Association, W. P. Price, Esq., of Tibberton Court, Gloucestershire, was called to the chair.

The Chairman said, he gladly availed himself of the opportunity of saying how highly he felt flattered at being called upon a second time to preside over this association. When he presided twenty years ago, he was strongly impressed with the belief that a great revolution was impending in the religious thought of the age. The intelligence and education of the country, he thought, had altogether outgrown its theology, and the time for change, in accordance with its progress in other respects, could not be postponed. That movement had set in with a rapidity which seems to have left those who were foremost far behind it, and in a direction which has varied the relation in which this institution stands towards the world. He remembered the time when very few outside our own denomination cared to know what our opinions are, and if we were called upon to disclose them, the revelation affected the inquirer with indignation, or shocked him with surprise. These opinions

have now, with greater or less shades of variety, become the opinions of the larger number of the educated and thoughtful portion of the age. But what astonished and amused him the most was to observe in how many quarters, which ought to be better informed, and with how much simplicity, these opinions were offered to the world, as though they had not been the opinions of a body of professing Christians for so many long years of weary controversy and patient trust. Our attitude in reference to this movement of thought in our age is one of thankfulness and not of discontent, and our work is to hold out a friendly hand to those whom it has overtaken and surprised—a great and noble work if we can succeed in bringing within the pale of a practical and rational Christianity, some of the many thousands who are tossed to and fro between Atheism and Pantheism; but to do this we must still keep our light burning over the great ocean of doubt and difficulty; and he knew not how we could do this better than by this Society, which had laboured so long for what we believed to be the truth.

At the close of the Chairman's address the Secretary read a list of deputations from local Societies and Congregations, in number about forty,—among them the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, from the Scottish Unitarian Association; the Rev. E. Kell, from the Southern Unitarian Fund; the Rev. J. Worthington, from the East Lancashire Unitarian Association, and Michael Andrews, Esq., from the Belfast Unitarian Society. A. Lawrence, Esq., expressed the hearty gratification of the Committee at receiving so many deputations from the country, especially as an indication that this was not a local but a National Society. As a member of Committee holding fast himself to the old landmarks, he felt that they could all join, with different shades of thought, in carrying forward the work of missionary enterprise in all parts of the country. He then moved that the Association give a hearty welcome to the deputations from Societies and Congregations, and that for the day's proceedings they be invested with the privileges of honorary members. This motion was seconded by D. Martineau, Esq., and passed unanimously.

The Secretary, the Rev. B. B. Aspland, then read the Annual Report, from which we take the following extracts:—

"In the foreign department, the Committee report the continuance of their friendly relations with the Unitarian churches of Transylvania. During the past year, Mr. Gregory Benczedi has, under the supervision of your Committee, been entered a student of Manchester New College and of University College. The Committee has charged itself with the educational expenses of Mr. Benczedi during his stay in England.

"The Committee are strongly impressed with the importance of maintaining friendly and serviceable relations with their brethren in Transylvania. The attempt on the part of the Austrian Government to crush them by closing their colleges was not only defeated, but was made, with the assistance of the friends of religious liberty in this country, the occasion of putting their educational system on an improved basis.

"From Adelaide the Committee have received, through the Rev. John Crawford Woods, a report of the growth and prosperity of the Unitarian Church in that city. Reports of progress were also given from other churches in the colonies.

"In regard to India, it was stated that whenever the Unitarians of England renew missionary work in India, it must be on a larger scale than hitherto attempted; and whatever use may then be made of native agents, the whole mission should be under the direction of an English missionary well qualified for the arduous duties of the post, and strengthened by the confidence of English Unitarians.

"The noble zeal of the American Unitarian Churches during the past year appears to deserve honourable mention. Notwithstanding the distractions and oppressive burthens of a civil war (now, it is hoped, brought to a close), the Unitarians of the United States have, in addition to their usual denominational efforts, raised more than one hundred thousand dollars, to be expended in the promotion of Unitarian Christianity, and they propose this year to repeat the noble effort.

"In addition to this, the churches of the States have recently held in the city of New York a convention, which was eminently successful, and may, in some respects, be regarded as one of the most remarkable ecclesiastical meetings ever held by Unitarians.

"Of the three missions in England and Scotland in existence last year, one (that in the Potteries) has ceased its operations. In lieu of the discontinued mission the Committee, at the beginning of the present year, connected themselves with a new and important organisation at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, worked under the able and zealous superintendence of the Rev. J. C. Street. The Northumbrian and Durham Unitarian Association takes under its charge several missionary churches in the two counties, especially Sunderland and Middlesborough. Two missionaries have been appointed; both were recently students at the Unitarian Home Missionary Board.

"The Scottish Mission, under the charge of the Rev. W. Sharman, has been worked by him with energy and success. Stationed at Aberdeen, the little church at which place is growing in strength, and is somewhat increased in numbers, he has paid frequent visits to Dundee, where a regular Unitarian Church is re-established, which will, it is hoped, soon require, and in part support, a minister of its own."

Jerom Murch, Esq., Mayor of Bath, moved the adoption of the Report and the Treasurer's account. He said, the report amply proved that this was not merely a London association; and he could not help asking himself, when he heard the various information given respecting our churches in various countries, if we had not this association, what should we learn about these interesting churches, and how would the zeal of the Unitarians of this country be stimulated in their behalf? And so with the churches in our own country. How should we know how to act towards them but for the information given by this Society? He felt that it was a great reflection upon the Unitarian body that it only had an income from subscriptions of about £500; it ought to have at least £2,000 a year.

The Rev. H. Knott (Plymouth) seconded the resolution, which was passed unanimously.

Resolutions were carried, instructing the Committee to continue the several missions, and, when the funds would permit, to extend their missionary agency to other districts,—and directing their attention to the subject of religious liberty, that timely resistance may be given to all measures tending to interfere with the liberty of Unitarians, or to retard the accomplishment of perfect religious equality.

The Rev. James Martineau moved an address to the President, officers, and members of the American Unitarian Association, expressive of sympathy with them and their countrymen in the calamity that had befallen them in the death of their President, and hearty congratulations at the prospect of the early cessation of civil war, and of the immediate and entire abolition of the curse of slavery. He felt that it would be inappropriate in an assembly convened at a time so deeply interesting to our brethren in America, to meet without expressing deep sympathy and interest in this great crisis of their affairs. He had been one of those who thought it most becoming, not only in the Government of this country, but also in private individuals, whilst watching the great struggle now brought to a close with deep and anxious interest, to observe a strict neutrality, because the war involved such complications that it was the proper duty of foreigners to stand at a careful distance, while the great arbitration of force was applied to a question which had gone beyond the reach of reason. But when the fermenting political passions, in the fury of disappointment, burst into an outbreak of private crime, then, in every Englishman's heart, there was an instant echo to the cry of anguish that came to us from America. It becomes us to recognise the solemn responsibility of our brethren, especially in the ministry, who will have so large a share in guiding public opinion. New fields of action are opening out to them by the removal of that blight upon their country, the curse of slavery. We have now to encourage and strengthen their hands in duties which they have shown their eagerness to undertake. So long as they were divided among themselves as to their duty in regard to the great evil of slavery, he had abstained from joining in the admonitions from this country to our brethren across the Atlantic, having little faith in mere advice addressed to men as wise and conscientious as ourselves. But now that the course of events had brought them all to one mind and cleared the course of future duty, the word we may send is one, not of reproach, but of unconditional sympathy, and may give strength and help.

The Rev. Brooke Herford seconded the resolution, which was also supported by the Rev. J. Payne. J. Bayly, Esq., Plymouth, opposed it; but after considerable interruption and excitement, finding that the meeting was almost entirely opposed to him, he was satisfied with protesting against it, and did not move an amendment. The motion was then put and carried with the marked and almost unanimous expression of the feeling of the meeting in its favour.

The Rev. J. J. Tayler briefly proposed that a petition in favour of the bill now before Parliament for the abolition of ecclesiastical tests be adopted by the meeting, and presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Alderman J. C. Lawrence, M.P. W. Wansey, Esq., seconded the resolution. It was also supported by H. A. Bright, Esq., of Liverpool, who said that the Universities of England were not the schools of any particular sect, but of the whole nation, and that he and others should be debarred of the right of suffrage in the University of Cambridge (of which he was an M.A.) was an intolerable grievance. The two greatest names of the University were Isaac Newton and John Milton, and it was monstrous

that those who were theologically their descendants should be prevented from exercising those rights and privileges which were granted to every man who passed through the ordinary examinations, and remained a certain time at the University.

The resolution was then carried.

After various routine resolutions of thanks, and the appointment of the officers of the association,

The Rev. S. Bache (Birmingham) rose, and said that he wished it to be understood that he was alone responsible for what he was about to say. No man living was more desirous than he was of recognising the right of every man to think for himself. But he could not shut his eyes to the facts that were forced upon him. Since the last meeting of the association he had had forced upon his attention very numerous statements in our periodicals and by our ministers, which go to the distinct rejection of the special Divine mission and authority of Jesus. He did not say a word against the right of those men to hold and utter these opinions; he had not a thought of hostility towards them in his heart; nay, if he could turn them to his own way of thinking by lifting up his finger, he would not lift it, because he felt that was not a right way of convincing them. But he felt that he could not, as an honest man, continue associating for the express purpose of maintaining and promulgating Christian opinions with those who denied those opinions; and if they came in by altering the significance of the terms by which the objects of this association are defined, he could not continue to be allied with them. When this association was formed its founders implied the special recognition of the Divine authority of Christ; it was only on that principle he would have joined the association. Nor until of late years had he believed that there was a single minister who denied the Divine mission and authority of Christ. He therefore felt it his duty to propose the following resolution, for which, he repeated, he alone was responsible:—"That whereas, since the last annual meeting of this association the terms 'Christ,' 'Christian,' and 'Christianity' have been employed by some Unitarian writers and in some Unitarian publications as consistent with the either clearly-implied or distinctly-avowed repudiation of the special and immediate Divine origin and authority of the Christian revelation; and whereas an ambiguity has thereby been occasioned in the terms which at present define the principles and objects of this Unitarian Association, the committee for the ensuing year be instructed to take measures for the removal of that ambiguity, and so to express the principles and objects of the association that no reasonable doubt may remain respecting them."

A long discussion then took place as to whether these resolutions could be received. The question arising whether it was seconded, the Rev. Thomas Madge seconded it very emphatically, but without making any speech. As a point of order it was then ruled by the chairman that it was hardly competent for the meeting to give to the committee an instruction which would really involve a grave alteration in the constitution of the society, and Mr. Bache adopted the suggestion of the chairman, that he should give notice of his intention to bring forward a resolution embodying the change which

he wished to be made, as a substantive motion at the next annual meeting.

Jerom Murch, Esq., President-Elect, then took the chair, and the cordial thanks of the meeting were given to the President.

The annual collation took place at the Crystal Palace on the following day. The company assembled at four o'clock in the large dining-hall. Nearly four hundred ladies and gentlemen were present. At the conclusion of the repast the chairman (W. P. Price, Esq.) introduced, after the usual loyal toasts, "Civil and Religious Liberty," "The British and Foreign Unitarian Association," "Our Academical Institutions," "A Welcome to the Visitors and the Deputations," "Our Missions in England and Scotland," and other toasts, which were responded to by Sir J. Bowring, Revs. J. J. Tayler, J. Martineau, B. Herford, J. P. Hopps, T. Poynting, and J. C. Street.

LONDON SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

The annual breakfast of this Society took place on Thursday morning, 8th June, at Radley's Hotel, Blackfriars. A public meeting was afterwards held, under the presidency of the Rev. Dr. Sadler. There was a large attendance both at the breakfast and the meeting which followed.

The Chairman in his opening address said that the objects of this Society, next to that, of course, of calling attention and bearing witness to the importance of the great work to which it is devoted, were to form a bond of union to solve problems of great practical interest, and to furnish the teacher with the best implements for his work. Of course, the greatest of all preparations for all religious teaching consists in the love of religion, and in the love of those to whom it is to be imparted; but it is not to be forgotten that as there is a difference between the highly gifted and the ungifted, so there is also a difference between the well prepared and the unprepared. I know that in a large number of instances teachers cannot have the preparation that they desire, and that is desirable in them; but, my friends, we never lose anything by always keeping before us a high standard of the work in which we are engaged, and it is only by these means that we can hope to inspire in the learner that faith, without which all teaching and all learning soon become wearisome and dead.

The Report of the Committee was read by the Secretary, Mr. Wade, and was in the main satisfactory: it noticed a decrease in the attendance in some Schools, chiefly to be attributed to the want of teachers,—and dwelt on the desirableness of a graduated series of class-books better adapted to the wants of the schools, as well as class-books in Natural History, or "God Seen in his Works." Resolutions were passed adopting the Report, requesting the Committee to take the subject of new class-books into their earnest consideration, and welcoming the representatives of other Associations who had attended their meeting.

THE IRISH UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN SOCIETY.

The anniversary sermons of this Society were preached in the Unitarian Church of St. Stephen's-Green, Dublin, on Sunday, the 21st of May, by the Rev. Wm. J. Odgers, of Bath, from Job xlii. 7, and Rom. xv. 13.

The members and friends of the Society held a social meeting in the School-rooms underneath the Church, on the evening of Tuesday, the 23rd of May. After tea, the chair was taken by the President, James W. Murland, Esq., who, in a lucid address, dwelt on the principles of Unitarianism. "The Irish Unitarian Christian Society" was then proposed by the Chairman, and responded to by the Secretary, the Rev. George A. Armstrong. James Haughton, Esq., J.P., proposed "the cordial thanks of the Society to the Rev. William J. Odgers for his valuable services on Sunday last."

The Rev. W. J. Odgers, in responding, after expressing his great pleasure in becoming personally acquainted with so many Unitarian friends in Ireland, advocated steadfast attachment to the faith they professed, and referred at some length to the writings of the Dean of Westminster and the Dean of St. Paul's, in reference to subscription to articles, and to the opinions of Jowett, Maurice, and others, respecting the doctrine of Atonement and Eternal Punishment, and afterwards spoke of the great importance of circulating as widely as possible such books and tracts as those furnished by the Irish Unitarian Christian Society.

REMONSTRANT SYNOD OF ULSTER.

The Annual Meeting of this body was held in the First Meeting-house, Rosemary Street, Belfast, on Tuesday, June 20. The Moderator,—the Rev. Moore Getty,—conducted devotional exercises and preached. The Rev. W. Napier of Ballymoney was unanimously chosen Moderator for the next twelve months. For the office of Assistant Clerk, two candidates were proposed,—the Rev. S. Moore, Narrow-water, and the Rev. J. Porter, Ballee. Mr. Moore was elected. It was agreed that the next Annual Meeting of Synod be held in Belfast, on the third Tuesday of June, 1866.

The reports of Presbyteries were then received; in that of the Bangor Presbytery, reference was made to the retirement of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery from the active duties of the ministry, and on the motion of the Rev. W. Crozier, seconded by the Rev. S. Ferguson, and supported by several other members, all of whom expressed themselves in terms of the deepest sympathy and respect, it was agreed that a resolution of condolence and sympathy with the Rev. Doctor, and also with the Rev. James Mulligan of Moira, who had been recently prostrated by severe illness, be prepared and forwarded. Some discussion arose respecting the Synodical Library, which it had been agreed to establish, and the Rev. John Orr gave notice that he would propose at next Annual Meeting, that the other sections of the Irish Non-Subscribing Church be invited to co-operate with this Synod in the formation and management of the intended Library. The only remaining subject for consideration was the supply of students for the ministry. This important matter was taken up *in interloquitur*, on Wednesday.

The following is the resolution of condolence referred to above: "That this Synod has heard with feelings of profound sorrow of the severe illness with which it has pleased Divine Providence to visit our highly-esteemed brethren, the Rev. Dr. Montgomery and the Rev. James Mulligan, and we embrace this opportunity to tender to them our sincere and cordial sympathy in their affliction; that, deeply sensible of their eminent services to our Church, we lament their absence from this our Annual Meeting, and earnestly pray that it may please God to restore them to health; and that we may again be cheered by their presence and benefited by their aid and counsel."

NORTHERN SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The Annual Meeting of this Association was held in the Vestry of the Second Meeting-house, Belfast, on Tuesday evening, June 20, the Rev. John Porter in the chair. After prayer by the Rev. T. Bowring, the chairman referred to the Annual Report which had been put into his hand: he considered it very judicious; and he felt on reading it that the committee had acted with great discretion during the past year. After some other remarks he called on the Secretary, the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, to read the report. The report detailed the proceedings of the Committee for the past year, and dwelt on the necessity of having all books for their Sunday-Schools low priced and simple: it noticed the commendable efforts made by two kindred societies in London and the North of England, to promote Sunday School education, and concluded by expressing a hope, that the absence of the returns from various Schools arose rather from the neglect of the Superintendents than from the cessation of the Schools. On the motion of the Rev. Joseph M'Fadden, seconded by the Rev. R. Cleland, the Report and Treasurer's Account were adopted and ordered to be printed. Resolutions, affirming the importance of Sunday School education, expressing sympathy with the London and the Manchester Sunday School Societies, and thanking the Hibernian Bible Society for its continued liberality were brought forward by the Revs. T. Bowring, C. J. M'Alester, and Messrs. L. Drennan and W. Spackman. On the motion of the Secretary, thanks were conveyed to the chairman for his kindness in presiding, and the meeting closed with singing and the benediction.

OBITUARY.

Died, on June 8, at the Craigs, Ballyclare, Jane, youngest daughter of the late Captain Gillis.

Died, on June 9, at Macclesfield, Cheshire, the Rev. J. C. Meeke, Minister of King Edward Street Chapel.

Died, on June 2, Mr. John Kernochan, of Drumranken, Ballymena.

Died, on June 21, at 14, Howard Street, Belfast, John Creery Ferguson, M.B., Professor in Queen's College, Belfast, aged 62 years.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] AUGUST, 1865. [No. 7.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

THE most extensive and influential organization of the Unitarian denomination in these kingdoms is that of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association: its members are chiefly English, but both in Scotland and Ireland there are a few subscribers to its funds, and it aims at helping the Unitarian cause by the circulation of books and tracts, and by missionary labours at home and abroad. It takes no narrow and authoritative creed as its basis, but, in simple and intelligible terms, it declares its object to be "the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad, the support of its worship, the diffusion of biblical, theological, and literary knowledge on topics connected with it, and the maintenance of the civil rights and interests of its professors." It will be seen that the foundation on which it rests is Unitarian Christianity, which, however, it does not rigidly define by enumerating a series of articles that make up its creed, but presents it in its broadest form, meaning to unite for its promotion those who hold its leading principles, however, in the exercise of free inquiry, they may differ respecting minute details. If it be asked, what are we to understand by Unitarian Christianity, as the phrase occurs in the rules of the Association, we refer to the views which were held in common by its founders, and to the leading principles and doctrines which its various publications exhibit. Amid diversities of opinion which these publications present, there are traceable certain dogmatic views which it was the aim of the members of the Association to promote. It is true that, with the advocacy of distinct views in theology, they sought also to help the

cause of civil and religious liberty, not for themselves alone, but for all their fellow-men. Grateful for the revelations of truth which the exercise of free inquiry had brought to themselves, they desired to remove every restriction that checked inquiry among others; and, sensitively alive to the disadvantages under which unjust and partial laws placed their own denomination, they laboured to remove every law which imposed penalties on those who dissented from the Established Church, or denied the popular faith. Hence we find them using every influence they could command, to win for their Roman Catholic brethren the rights that had been so long withheld from them; and to the efforts of the Unitarian Association may be given a portion of the honour of securing the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill in 1829. Whatever movement has been made, from the time of its organization, to enlarge the liberties of the people at home, or to remove the fetters from the slave in our colonies—to gain for the Jew his civil rights, and for all the liberty to believe or disbelieve, as their judgment and conscience led them,—received from this Association a hearty and generous support.

It has been said again and again, with much truth, that liberty is bound up with Unitarianism, and that the Unitarian who interferes with the liberty of his fellow-man, or seeks to impose upon him a creed, is recreant to the principles he professes. And so it is with this Unitarian body; it has never sought to interfere with the exercise of free inquiry on the part of any; and if it ever should do so, it would be shamefully departing from those principles of freedom which are a part of its existence. But while the Association is thus the advocate and friend of freedom for all, Protestant and Catholic, Christian, Jew, and Heathen, it is, in its opinions, to a certain extent dogmatic, and is established for promoting distinctive views of religion—one particular interpretation of Christianity. It has been asked recently—"Is the Association to be *inclusive* or *exclusive?*" and laboured articles have been written, in reference to the notice of motion given at the late annual meeting by the Rev. Samuel Bache, to prove that, consistently with its principles, it can *exclude* none—must *include* all. We

venture to differ from the high authorities who have thus argued, and to believe that by its constitution, loosely though it is expressed, it is both *inclusive* and *exclusive*. It is *inclusive*, for it is evidently designed to embrace those who hold different views of Christ's nature, if only they accept his divine office,—different views of the Holy Scriptures, if only they admit that they contain a divine revelation,—different opinions respecting the rite of baptism, and many other points, if only they acknowledge the oneness and the Fatherhood of God, and the authority of the Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice. The Association never sought to bind down its members to accurately defined opinions on such topics as we have noticed, but aimed at admitting the utmost latitude in what were justly regarded as subordinate and unimportant matters. So far it was *inclusive*: but let not the enthusiastic lover of "absolute freedom" be shocked when we state that the Association is also *exclusive*. Its basis is not merely the Protestant principle of the right of private judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures, for that would include all who acknowledge the authority of Scripture, and exercise their judgment in its interpretation, no matter how opposite the opinions at which they may arrive—much less is it "fearless free inquiry," which would include all honest thinkers, whether the result of their inquiry led them to Rome, Geneva, or Oxford—to Christ, Mahommed, or Budda. It necessarily excludes all Trinitarians, for its object is to promote Unitarian Christianity, as opposed to Trinitarian Christianity; and thus it cuts itself off from the Church of Rome, the Church of England, and all the Dissenters who are, by a strange misnomer, distinguished as *Evangelical*. It also excludes all who do not accept Christianity, for it is founded to promote Christianity, not Secularism, or Deism, or Atheism, or Parkerism. And when the founders of the Association stamped its constitution with that significant word—*Christianity*—will it for a moment be supposed that they meant to express by it, or to include in it, a denial of the Christ, a denial of his mission, his authority, or his resurrection? Then it excludes also all who deny Christ, although they may admit the wisdom and the virtue of Jesus,—and still

more, it excludes those who believe that others have since appeared in the world, as good and as gifted as he. A belief in Christianity pre-supposes a belief in a personal God, and, therefore, the Association excludes those who believe in no God, or who believe the universe itself to be God.

There is a fashionable cant about liberty which threatens to blot out all distinctions between truth and error, and to render men indifferent about what they believe. If exclusion were associated with intolerance, and sought to impose penalties on those who were without, it would indeed be in the highest degree reprehensible; but if earnest inquirers have arrived at views which, they believe, minister to the best interests of themselves and the world, it is not only right, but incumbent on them, to associate and labour for their promotion. Such were the motives which actuated the founders of the Association; and while they were in one sense "exclusive," they were neither enemies to free inquiry, nor were they the advocates of intolerance.

Recently opinions have been avowed by ministers connected with the Association, which, so far from being in harmony with Unitarian Christianity, are not even distinctively Christian; and the leading journals of the denomination have argued in behalf of admitting into the Association every phase of thought which free inquiry may throw up, no matter how extravagant or anti-Christian it may be. Where there are diversities of opinion among the members of an Association, all of which are admitted and recognized, there can only be associated efforts to promote the opinions that are common to all, not those which are held merely by a portion of the body. Thus among the members of the Unitarian Association some are advocates of infant and some of adult baptism: the Association, therefore, as a body, properly abstains from inculcating one view or the other. If the members shall hold different views on leading points, as on the Divine mission of Christ, his resurrection, or the authority of Scripture, these subjects must be, in all fairness, sunk, and its efforts must be put forth to disseminate views held in common by all. What shall these views be? Gradually they must, we fear, become

purely negative: even positive teaching respecting a personal God being inadmissible, as some may be members who deride such a doctrine as superstition.

It was right for Mr. Bache to make an effort to guard the Association from the dangers into which it is fast drifting, and to seek a distinct statement of the principles and objects for which they were united. That he has brought down on him a torrent of declamation about creeds and tests and intolerance is only what a similar experience led us to expect; but we trust that such invectives will not drive him from his purpose. We are thankful to him that he has been instrumental in leading to the discussion, in England, of a question that was by many supposed to belong almost exclusively to the North of Ireland.

The London Inquirer has, of course, taken up the cause of the free inquirers and free thinkers; and, while itself professing to be very orthodox in its belief, is ready to open the Association to all comers, no matter how wild their speculations, or how rank their scepticism. It rings the changes on liberty and catholicity, speaks of "the noble memories and traditions" of its "spiritual fathers," declaims about the free and undogmatic character of our church, and argues for "a church of the freeborn which shall include *all reverent doubters!*" We wonder what the spiritual fathers of the church would think, if they saw its principles forgotten, and its pulpits opened to all "reverent doubters." A correspondent of *The Inquirer*, the Rev. James Taplin, writes in a similar strain, and alleges that the members of the Association "unite on the broad Protestant basis, the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture," which just means in this case, if it means anything, the right to reject Scripture altogether, and yet hold by the profession of Unitarian Christianity.

The Rev. J. P. Hopps, in his *Truth-Seeker*, takes the same ground as *The Inquirer*, represents the Unitarian Church as one which "puts no limits to thought and bars no road to inquiry," and frankly admits that he has no particular anxiety for the preservation of the Unitarian denomination as such. It is quite true that our Church imposes no limits to inquiry; but we are not therefore to

infer that it regards no opinions as true, and values as nothing the views which it embodies. Mr. Hopps gravely tells us that "Christianity is not a creed." If he had said that it is not merely a creed, but a life and a power, he would have been right; but to allege that it does not involve the reception of certain doctrines is absurd, and remarkably illustrates the vague and loose ideas which have grown up in our denomination. Christianity demands a belief in a personal God, and a belief in Christ as the sent of God. Here then are two articles of a creed, which no fair reasoning can separate from Christianity, and without which Christianity is nothing. But Mr. Hopps must have strangely shifted his position, since some twelve months ago he issued an excellent tract entitled, "What do we, as Unitarian Christians, believe?" In that tract he enumerates very clearly the leading doctrines, or in other words the creed, of Unitarians, and he labours to show to those who fancy we believe nothing and deny everything, that we do believe in God, in the Holy Spirit, in Christ, in the Atonement, and in the Bible; but now, he pleads for those who would join the Unitarian Association, and become ministers of Unitarian Congregations, while they reject the Christ, scoff at the Bible, and sometimes dare even to question the existence of God himself. With Mr. Hopps' altered opinions, we recommend that he should employ his ready pen and fluent speech for the dissolution of the Unitarian Association, and the establishment, on its ruins, of "an Association of Truth-Seekers;" and we would suggest, as an appropriate motto for the new organization, 2 Tim. iii. 7,—"Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

Happily, in the discussion to which Mr. Bache's notice of motion has given rise, there are not wanting advocates for maintaining the Christianity of the Unitarian Association; conspicuous already among them is the Rev. J. Panton Ham, of Essex Street Chapel, London, who, in one of his letters to *The Inquirer*, thus clearly presents the question at issue:—

"I presume that Mr. Bache wishes to have a distinct and definite statement, whether the British and Foreign Unitarian Association is an association of persons recognising solely the principles of absolute freedom, and therefore open to all professing

the widest divergences of opinion on matters of religion, of course to the Deist, and the Atheist, as well as to the Christian ; or whether it is an association of persons who recognise the Divine authority of Jesus as the Christ of God, and so distinctly and exclusively Christian in its constitution and objects."

Such is exactly the point to be decided. Judging from the tone of the recent meeting of the Association, and also of various provincial meetings subsequently held, there is every reason to apprehend that the prevailing feeling in England is in favour of "absolute religious liberty,"—which, in any specific organization, is absolute nonsense, —and of the swamping of those glorious principles, which our spiritual fathers sought to uphold by the formation of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.

(*Continued from p.* 197).

III.—The third Minister of Cairncastle was WILLIAM TAYLOR, who was ordained there on June 14, 1715, and continued in the pastoral charge of that Congregation until his death, which took place in May, 1734. Mr. Taylor seems to have been a life-long invalid ; for though his ministry in Cairncastle was comparatively short, yet during the last five or six years of it he was obliged to avail himself of the services of an assistant, who afterwards became his successor, viz. :—John Lewson. For a knowledge of the dates of Mr. Taylor's Incumbency I am indebted to a "Brief Memoir of the Life and Character of the Rev. Mr. W. Taylor," by Dr. James Kirkpatrick of Belfast, which, together with similar Memoirs of three other founders of the Antrim Presbytery (viz :—Messrs. Thomas Shaw, Michael Bruce, and Samuel Haliday) is published, as an Appendix to Duchal's Sermon on the death of Mr. John Abernethy (Belfast, 1741). Had it not been for this source of information, we should probably have known very little, beyond local tradition, about Mr. Taylor or his ministry in Cairncastle ; seeing that the Minutes of "the Antrim Meeting," of the Synodical

Presbytery of Templepatrick, and of the Presbytery of Antrim for that period are all lost; and as I never heard of any Congregational Records in Cairncastle to supply the deficiency, my materials for this portion of my narrative are rather limited, referring indeed almost entirely to the personal and family history of Mr. Taylor himself.

Mr. William Taylor of Cairncastle, was the son of the Rev. William Taylor, minister of Randalstown, who was Moderator of Synod in 1710 (see *Wodrow's Correspondence*, i., 153). And I am inclined to think that this Mr. Taylor of Randalstown, was the same person who, on August 4, 1674, had been introduced to the Antrim Meeting by Mr. Robert Patton, minister of Ballyclare, as a young man preparing for the ministry in the Presbyterian Church. At that date, and on several subsequent occasions, he is designated as "William Taylor, a poor scholar;" but the latter epithet did not imply any social degradation, for in those days nearly all young men before going to College applied to "the meeting" for pecuniary assistance, which was always cordially given, although along with it was also given to the applicant a designation which, in the present day, is liable to be misunderstood. Supposing, then, that the foregoing conjecture is correct, it is highly probable that the father of Mr. Taylor of Cairncastle, came originally from the neighbourhood of Ballyclare. In early life, Mr. W. Taylor, jun. is said to have been a tutor in the family of the Uptons, of Castle Upton, near Templepatrick. Here he met his future wife, Mary Latimer, who was also a member of the same Presbyterian household; and as the Shaws of Ballygally (in Cairncastle) were closely connected by marriage with the Upton family, it is very possible that this circumstance promoted the settlement of young Mr. Taylor in the Congregation with which we are now concerned.

In 1722 was evidently gathering the storm which a few years afterwards burst over the General Synod of Ulster. With a view of averting, if possible, the threatened disruption of the Irish Presbyterian Church, a paper was addressed and presented "To the Reverend General Synod of Ulster, to meet at Londonderry the 19th day of June, 1722," which paper was headed "The humble representation of the Gentlemen of the Presbyterian persuasion

whose names are hereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves, and of all who think fit to adhere to them." Of this interesting document a copy, evidently contemporaneous, has been kindly given to me (with some other similar papers), by Mr. Dalway of Bellahill; and as it contains the names of those who signed the "representation," (in which respect it differs from any other copy I have ever heard of), it furnishes us with a highly valuable list of "the gentlemen of the Presbyterian persuasion" in Ulster, who, in 1722, pleaded for peace and toleration. For this reason I give in a note, a complete copy of the signatures which appear attached to this document, adding their residences, wherever I have felt myself authorized, either by actual knowledge or reasonable conjecture, so to do; and no Northern Presbyterian can read the names, and compare their past with their present owners, without being led into melancholy reflections on the social decadence of his church, which this list too clearly indicates. No less than five of these Presbyterian "gentlemen" were members of the Cairncastle Congregation, viz.:—James M'Culloch, (No. 2), James Tullis, Robert Mathy, (or Mathews), William M'Culloch, John Shaw. All the information which I have been able to gather respecting these Presbyterian gentry of Cairncastle, in 1722, or as much of it as could be supposed to interest the general reader will be found at the close of the note above referred to.*

* Signatures to "the humble representation to the General Synod of Ulster in 1722," of certain "gentlemen of the Presbyterian persuasion":—

"James M'Culloch, Duncan or Randalstown (?); David Craford, Crawfordsburn (?); Hamilton Maxwell, Drumbeg, near Lisburn; William Rainey, Mount Panther, County Down (?); Hugh Maxwell, County Down; Jo. Kennedy, Cultra; David Boyd; Samuel Boyd; Hill Hunter; John Chalmers; John Black; Tho. Lyle; Daniel Mussenden, County Down; Robert Wilson, Purdysburn and Magheramorne (?); Edward Brice, Kilroot and Belfast; Victor Ferguson, Belfast; Ja. M'Culloch, Cairncastle; James Tullis, Cairncastle; Robert Mathy, Cairncastle; Wm. M'Culloch, Cairncastle; Jo. Williamson; Jo. M'Master; John Shaw, Cairncastle; Henry Shaw, The Bush, near Antrim; John Ker, Ballymena, now of Portavo (?); Dom. Heyland, Coleraine, afterwards of Crumlin; James Read; Hugh Hamilton, Castle Hamilton, near Ballymena (?); Robert Liston, Carrickfergus (?); Robert Dalway, Bellahill; Robert Blackwood, Ballyleidy; Robert Ferguson, Donegore (?); Neil M'Neil, Dundalk; Isaac M'Cartney, Belfast, and afterwards Lisanoure; Pat. Agnew, Kilwaughter; Mat. Crymble, Ballyclare; Will. Dobbin, Carrickfergus;

In 1724, the year of the trial for heresy of Mr. Nevin of Downpatrick, before the General Synod of Ulster at Dungannon, the two Mr. William Taylors—father and son—appear to have been members of that reverend body. Both their names, distinguished as senior and junior, occur on the "list of ministers who did not join in the

John Gault, sen., ancestor of John Galt Smith (?); Ja. Traill, The Route; Hugh Johnstone, Rademon (?); Charles Johnstone, Glynn, near Larne (?); Hugh Johnston, Ballywillwill (?); Alex. Stewart, Castle Stewart; Hugh Edwards, The Straw, County Derry (?); Robert Edwards; Robert Stewart, Newtownards (?)"

Of the five signatures amongst the foregoing which are connected with Cairncastle, that of the representative of the SHAWS of Ballygally requires no special notice here. The members of that ancient family were for many generations the patrons of the Cairncastle Congregation.

The M'CULLOCHS, formerly of Corkermain and Ballyrudder in Cairncastle, but latterly of Larne, came from Scotland, probably from Wigtownshire, as the name is often mentioned in Sir Andrew Agnew's Sheriffs of Galloway. The first of the family who settled in Ireland was JOHN M'CULLOCH, whose mother was probably a Tullis, in right of whom his son succeeded to Corkermain and Ballyrudder, which were, at an early date, granted in fee by the Earl of Antrim to "John Tullis, Clerk, in Dromain." John M'Culloch married Mary Ann Getty of Larne, whose mother, Helen Agnew, had been born in 1641, in the Larne Church, where the Protestants had taken refuge during the massacre of that year. By his wife, John M'Culloch had, in addition to five daughters, three sons,—1. JAMES TULLIS M'CULLOCH, who was Presbyterian minister, first of Newtownards, County Down, and afterwards of Kircrum, in Scotland, and whose only child, Maria M'Culloch, married at the latter place a stone mason called Crowe, to whom she brought the townland of Corkermain, which their son, Andrew Tullis M'Culloch Crowe, the poet of Cairncastle, afterwards sold to the late Mr. E. J. Agnew of Kilwaughter, and left the country. 2. PATRICK M'CULLOCH, who got from his elder brother (above named) a part of the townland of Ballyrudder in Cairncastle, which is still in possession of his descendants. Patrick M'Culloch, who married Mary, daughter of Rev. W. Taylor, of Cairncastle, had, in addition to one daughter (who died young and unmarried), one son, John M'Culloch, who was father of the late John M'Culloch, Solicitor, of Larne, and of Dr. William M'Culloch, who died young and unmarried. The late John M'Culloch, Solicitor, had also an only son, John, who is at present in New Zealand, and unmarried; so that in this young man, whom I baptized, is centred the representation, in the male line, of the highly respectable family of the M'Cullochs of Cairncastle and Larne. In the female line the race is creditably represented by Mrs. Houston (formerly of Larne), Mrs. A. R. Burke, and Mrs. C. W. Stewart (both of Larne), the wife of Rev. James Mulligan of Moira, Mrs. Henry Simpson of Moira, and her sister, Mrs. Halley. 3. WILLIAM M'CULLOCH, third son of John, first above-named, left a son William, who went to India and was never afterwards heard of; and a daughter, still spoken of in Larne legends as "Miss Polly M'Culloch," who lived with her relatives in Larne, and died there unmarried, at an advanced age in 1826.

The TULLIS family, of Corkermain and Ballyrudder in Cairncastle, have already been mentioned above, and in a note to page 150 of this

vote" for excluding Mr. Nevin from ministerial communion; and both are there given as belonging to "the Antrim Presbytery." But neither of their names is mentioned among those who protested against this vote of exclusion; from which I infer that at least Mr. William Taylor, jun., of Cairncastle, was not present on that occasion, being probably hindered by his delicate health; for it is not likely that, if he had been present, he would have declined joining his associates in the simple matter of protesting, when he did not hesitate, two years afterwards, to join them in the much more serious matter of separating from the General Synod, and founding the Presbytery of Antrim. This latter event took place, as is well known, in 1726; when Mr. William Taylor of Cairncastle and his Congregation seceded from the larger, and joined the smaller body. But the lamentable loss of the Minutes, for this interesting period, of the neighbouring Presbyteries, and the absence of congregational records in Cairncastle, for (I believe) any period, prevent me from being able to give any local incidents connected with this important fact in the history of the Congregation with which we are now concerned.* Indeed, I have no other incident of any kind to record in connexion with Mr. Taylor or his people, until we come to the death of Mr. Taylor himself, which, as already stated, took place in May, 1734. He was in

Memoir. An ivy-covered ruin at the foot of Miss Richards's garden in Dromain, formerly indicated the site of the residence of "John Tullis, Clerk in Dromain," who was the founder of this family, who got from the Antrim family, early in the 17th century, the original fee farm grant of Corkermain and Ballyrudder, and who seems to have been a clergyman in the Established Church. The family of Tullis has long been locally extinct in the legitimate male line, having been merged, by intermarriages, in the families of M'Culloch and Crowe successively, the latter of whom alienated a part of the ancestral inheritance.

The MATHEWS family will soon be mentioned again, and therefore I defer for the present any notice of them.

*I have heard of a tradition in Cairncastle to the effect, that at this time a large number of people from the neighbourhood of Antrim, or (more probably) Templepatrick, came to Cairncastle to breed dissension in Mr. Taylor's Congregation, and induce them to desert his ministry; that they pitched their tents (literally) on the Meeting-house Green, and that during the night these tents were all blown down by a tremendous storm, which, I suppose, dispersed their occupants, and sent them home to their own country. Certainly there was nothing more heard at this time of the attempted split in the Cairncastle Congregation.

terred on the 2nd day of that month, as appears from the following entry in the Funeral Register of the First Congregation, Belfast:—"1734, May 2. Rev. Mr. Taylor of Cairncastle, best moreloth 5s; 6 cloaks, 12s." His remains were laid in the beautifully situated burying-ground which surrounds Cairncastle Church, and tradition states that the large and venerable tree which adorns that churchyard, marks the spot where was laid the head of the third minister of Cairncastle. There is no tombstone, nor inscription of any kind over his grave; which circumstance, as well as respect for his memory and esteem for his descendants, induces me to insert here Dr. James Kirkpatrick's brief memoir of his life and character, to which I have already alluded.

"Mr. Taylor, jun., was as much the man he appeared to be, as most men I have known. He had a presence that spoke frankness and boldness of spirit, and a good deal of warmth, and he had in truth a warm heart, and a strong resolved temper of mind. This evidently appeared in all matters of importance in which he was engaged, especially those that most immediately concerned his own station and business in life. But the earnestness of his spirit was under the direction of very good sense, and a sound judgment. He could reason with great strength, and was a weighty speaker, mixing the rational and pathetic very happily. And as the whole of his behaviour was smoothed and polished by good breeding, which he thoroughly understood, he was very agreeable in society, and acceptable in the best companies; a man of whom his friends could have upon no occasion reason to be ashamed. When he came to be known to the world by his public performances, there were strong appearances that religion intimately possessed his heart; and that the natural warmth of his temper was turned into zeal for God. His prayers and sermons discovered much ardour of spirit, and were not a little recommended by the useful instruction contained in them, and the propriety both of matter and words that was obvious to every judicious hearer. His performances were never mean, and he had a talent of enlarging much upon the subjects he treated, to very good purpose, and of setting them in a clear and strong light. His thoughts were just, and he spoke with much energy, warming his hearer's heart, while he enlightened his understanding. When the cause of liberty became the subject of public controversy, he quickly espoused it, and all his life long continued a steadfast friend to it. He never seemed to engage in anything with more warmth than in recommending charity, and standing up for the rights of Christians and Protestants. He could not bear anything narrow and confined, which he accounted utterly unworthy of the Christian spirit. He bore his share in the defence of liberty, constantly and cheerfully, and not a small one in the difficulties to which the advocates of it were exposed. A convinced judgment

and determined resolution made him steadfast and immoveable in this. And it appeared plainly that all interests and views of the temporal kind must give way to conscience. His natural firmness was happily hallowed by the grace of God. His pastoral labours were very acceptable to the best judges, and they were delight to himself. He seemed to have much pleasure in reading and meditation, and in composing sermons, and was happy when he had reason to believe his compositions were pleasing and edifying to others. He took pleasure in being at pains to adorn the pulpit, and to appear in it in a worthy manner, always zealous in propagating the genuine Christian spirit, and holy love as the very essence of it. It was a great loss to his own people, and to his friends in the neighbourhood, that he was so soon and so long confined by very calamitous bodily disorders. He was, in the latter part of his life, very little abroad, and lamented much that he was incapable of performing those services to his congregation that required labour and travel. His disorders grew gradually upon him till they overpowered a constitution naturally strong, and that promised longer life. But in his long confinement he wonderfully retained his spirit, and his relish for those enjoyments of life, especially the conversation of worthy friends, that had been the entertainment of his best days. In a word, he was like himself in life and death, and will be remembered by those that knew him, as a man of real worth, as much a gentleman, and of a serious spirit. He was ordained in Cairncastle, June 14th, 1715; where he continued to his death in May, 1734."*

During his residence in Cairncastle, Mr. Taylor lived in the house which had been previously occupied by his predecessors, Messrs. Adair and Campbell, and which is now tenanted by one of the M'Kee family, (*see* back, p. 154.) Mr. Taylor married, as already stated, Mary Latimer, whom he had met at Castleupton; and by her he had two daughters, (1.) Mary, who married Patrick M'Culloch of Cairncastle, as mentioned in a previous note, (*which see for Mr. Taylor's living descendants*), and (2.) Dorothea Margaret, who married a Mr. Johnston, of whom or of whose descendants nothing is now positively known. Besides these living representatives, Mr. Taylor also left a Manuscript Diary, which, if it could now be recovered, would, from some things that have been told me respect-

* In *Christian Moderator*, i. 431, is given a paper, which is stated to be in the handwriting of Rev. Thomas Drennan of Belfast, and entitled "Characters of a Reverend Society in the North of Ireland," meaning the Belfast Society, which was the germ of the Presbytery of Antrim. Some one of these characters most probably represents Mr. Taylor of Cairncastle, but as unfortunately no names are appended to the portraits, it is now impossible to identify the respective likenesses with any certainty.

ing its contents by persons who had seen it, be most interesting and amusing. For a long time this old diary was in the possession of Mr Taylor's great grandson, and my friend and hearer, the late John M'Culloch of Larne, solicitor; but it is now, I fear, irrecoverably lost. One of the entries which, I have been informed that it contained, is so quaint, that although it is not very flattering to the Congregation whose history I am now writing, I cannot resist the temptation of quoting it. It was to the following effect:—"Settled this day with the Treasurer of my Congregation for my year's stipend. Proceeds a very few pounds. God has cast my lot among a peculiar people. They promised me little. They pay me less." I fear that in this respect my Cairncastle neighbours have ceased to be peculiar. Mr. Taylor's arm chair, which proved him to have been a very large powerfully-built man, was also for a long time in the house of the above-named descendant; but was some years ago accidentally destroyed through no carelessness on the part of its owner. His tortoise shell snuff-box, which I have seen, with his initials cut on a silver plate, is now in the possession of his great-great grandson, John M'Culloch, of New Zealand; who, I hope, will duly value this relic of his truly respectable and deservedly honoured ancestor.

(*To be continued.*)

THE NARROW WAY.

[ORIGINAL.]

Up from the mountain's base it climbs,
  Rough and bare as a torrent's bed;
Thorns and brambles from side to side
  Cruel and sharp their branches spread.
Think not of rest till the hill be scaled,—
  Hope not to pause till the task be done,—
Constant effort and careful toil
  Must be thine ere the goal be won.

Be not afraid, though lions couch,
  Hungry-eyed, for thy strength to fail;

Pass thou on with a prayerful heart,
Strong in soul, though thy cheek may pale;
Siren voices and lovely shapes,
Softly pleading, may woo thy stay;
Hear not, heed not,—if thou wouldst win,—
Turn not back from the narrow way.

What though thou leavest sire or son,
Mother or sister, lover or friend?
Those who enter that toilsome path,
Loveless and lone too oft must wend.
Look not back,—thou shalt surely find
Glory and joy for fear and pain:
All thou hast lost and left behind,
Tenfold told, thou shalt yet regain.

Soon shall the weary way be past,
Soon shall the plains of heaven be near;
There the weary shall find their rest,
Gladness for weeping,—joy for fear.—
What though the present pang be sharp,—
Hold thy banner, unstained and pure;
Fear not all that the world can do,—
Servant of God, thy hope is sure.

THE PRIMARY AND DISTINCTIVE OFFICE AND WORK OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.*

My Friends,—In the addresses which I have on former occasions delivered to the students of this College, I have endeavoured to vindicate that reverence for profound scholarship which inspired the founders of this Institution three quarters of a century ago, and also to establish the great fundamental principles of inquiry after truth, by an adherence to which alone it can be successfully and beneficially prosecuted.

In the prosecution of this diligent and reverential search after truth, nothing is more important at the commence-

* An Address delivered to the Students of the Manchester New College, London, in University Hall, on Wednesday, June 21, 1865, by the Rev. Samuel Bache, of Birmingham.

ment than a clear definition of the object of our investigation: and in the further prosecution of our inquiries, especially in connection with religion, it is absolutely indispensable that we maintain and exercise complete, unbiassed, unfettered freedom of thought. This is the normal condition ordained by Providence of our healthful and progressive spiritual life; a condition, therefore, which every one of us is under the most sacred obligation to maintain himself and to respect in others. As a necessary consequence, diversities of opinion will be sure to arise; inasmuch as every man looks, of necessity, from his own stand-point, and within his own limited range of observation,—knows only in part, and can therefore affirm and profess only in part. From such diversities of opinion, correspondent diversities of profession and of action must frequently result: for as (to quote the sentiment of the great Italian patriot), "Opinion rules the world," so ought the clear and decided opinion of every individual consistently and conscientiously to rule himself.

By such a proceeding, two very important benefits are likely to be secured:—1. The faithful maintenance and avowal and application of these several diversities, brings them into more distinct and intelligible comparison with each other, and so renders the work of mutual correction or confirmation more practicable and efficient than, without such distinct enunciation, it could ever by possibility become. 2. By faithful individual adherence to conscientious conviction, the mind and soul are preserved in reverential subjection to what is believed to be the Divine will; in habitual obedience to what an apostle most appropriately, though with a seeming paradox, designates as "the perfect law of liberty." (James i. 25.)

By this devout practical recognition of what is held as the truth and will of God, the mind and soul are preserved in a condition of habitual readiness for whatever farther light and knowledge it may please our Heavenly Father to impart: as when Saul, conscientiously persecuting those whom he regarded as the enemies of God, because he verily thought with himself that he "*ought* to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth," (Acts xxvi. 9,) had distinct testimony granted

him to the Divine mission and Messiahship of that very Jesus, and was thereby instantly converted from Saul the persecutor to Paul the apostle; so that he could truly say in the presence of the Sanhedrim, after this great change in his views and sentiments had taken place, "Men and brethren, I have lived in good conscience before God until this day." (Acts xxiii. 1.)

And this is the universal law of God's moral and spiritual government. Men who, from indolence or indifference or double-mindedness, will not take the requisite pains to form and maintain for themselves distinct convictions, and to carry them out faithfully in their professions and conduct, will necessarily be of the number of those whom St. Paul justly reprehends as "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." (2 Timothy iii. 7.) As in physical and secular, so far more in spiritual inquiries, it is of the first importance that we should not *rest* satisfied with vague and indefinite conjectures, but should press on towards enlightened, consistent, conscientious conviction; whereby only is it possible that we can know the truth, and that the truth, thus placing us intellectually and spiritually in harmony with the will of God, can effectually make us free by bringing us under this "perfect law of liberty." We must "prove all things," and we must also "hold fast that which is good." We must "prove all things," not for the mere sake of exercising our intelligence and gratifying our curiosity, but in order that we may "hold fast that which is good;" and that which we deem, therefore, after patient, repeated, persevering inquiry, to be really "good, we are under the most sacred, moral, and spiritual obligation to "hold fast" so long as it continues to approve itself to our minds and hearts as really "good." (1 Thessalonians v. 21.)

In the recognition and practical application of these, with me, fundamental principles, I proceed, my friends, to offer to you a few considerations with the importance of which my own mind is deeply impressed, and which I earnestly commend to your serious thought:—not at all in the spirit of authoritative dictation,—(for no such authority do I ever claim, nor have ever in my life desired or endeavoured to exercise)—but in the spirit of frank and

friendly suggestion, recognising fully your perfect right, and therefore obligation, to receive or to reject these considerations according as they shall or shall not approve themselves to your own enlightened, free, deliberate, and serious judgment.

The subject to which the considerations which I propose briefly to lay before you immediately relate is this:—What is primarily and distinctively the office and work of the Christian Ministry?

That there is such a primary and distinctive office and work is beyond all question. Not only was it expressly contemplated by the original founders of this Manchester New College, but is still expressly recognised in the official notice of this year's meetings, in which I find it announced that "a Valedictory Religious Service, dedicating to the Christian Ministry the Students who have completed their course of study, will be held at Eight, P.M., on Thursday, 22nd of June, in Little Portland Street Chapel." Surely, then, the subject which I have announced is well deserving your candid and serious attention, and to such do I now, therefore, desire briefly and clearly to address myself.

I must treat this subject, if I treat it at all, on the principles and in the way which I announced at the commencement of my address, as what I deem indispensable to our attainment of any enlightened and beneficial result. I must endeavour to define the Christian Ministry; not in the least with the desire of imposing my definition upon you, but from the necessity of laying it down for myself as what I regard as the true and intelligible basis of all my subsequent observations.

What, then, *is* the Christian Ministry? I answer, in a word, it is that direct and special service of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ with a view to which your instruction and culture in this Institution have been immediately and mainly devoted to the study of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament, as containing the records of the special Divine Revelation which it has pleased our Heavenly Father to make to us of his will in connection with our moral and spiritual nature, duties, and destiny, through the precepts and life of Jesus of Nazareth, whom he sent into the world to bear witness to this very truth,

and who, by his *anointing* "with the Holy Spirit and with power" (Acts x. 38), was shown to be the Christ of God. If the Bible, and especially the New Testament, be nothing more (as some modern writers have affirmed) than Hebrew literature, asserting and vindicating no authoritative claim as the record of a direct and special revelation from God, then I should fully agree with one of these modern writers — (William Binns, *Unitarian Herald*, May 26, 1865, p. 168)—that it presents far "too narrow a basis to found a religion on," and I should be the first to demand that a much smaller amount of time and attention should be given to the study of it and to the preparatory and connected studies than your Theological course at present justly assigns. Nay, I should myself be strongly inclined to put aside the Bible and the studies immediately relating to it altogether; because, if it do not really contain the immediate and special revelation which it everywhere claims to set forth, it would do so much violence to my principles of truth and integrity that I *could* not thoughtfully, and frequently, and reverently read it without the apprehension that I might be trifling with those principles, and so endangering the very foundation of my moral and spiritual life. Nothing, as it appears to me, can vindicate the study of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament, to which in this College you devote yourselves, and the employment of it in our public religious assemblies as the principal agency in the great work of spiritual culture, but the faith that it contains the record of an immediate and special Divine Revelation, that the authority which the hearers of Jesus felt and recognised in his teachings was, what he declared it to be, not his own but the Father's who sent him, and must consequently be devoutly acknowledged and obeyed by every sincere disciple of Christ, and every enlightened and religious-minded son of God who receives his "spirit of adoption" through him. (Rom. viii. 15.)

Assuming the conviction of this fundamental truth, not merely in accordance with the claims of Jesus himself and his Apostles, but also on account of its being indispensable, as I think, to the vindication of our assiduous study and use of the Bible at all as a leading agency in religious and Christian culture, the office and work of the

Christian Ministry seems to me to be *primarily* the maintenance and promulgation of the fundamental truth of the Gospel, that Jesus is the Christ, that his Gospel is a special and direct revelation from God of vital spiritual truth, which the experience of ages past had abundantly proved that the unassisted intellect of man could not fully and conclusively discover for want of the very data which that Gospel so clearly and fully supplies; and that Christians are therefore under a sacred obligation to recognise Jesus Christ their divinely-appointed Teacher and Lord, and to receive his words, in connection with our moral and spiritual life and duties and destiny, as the words of the Father who sent him.

And as this is the *primary*, so it is also the *distinctive* office and work of the Christian Ministry. Let me not, however, be thought for a moment to intimate that the office and work of the Christian Ministry terminate here: this is only the commencement of them. As Jesus our Divine Master "*lived* the precepts which he taught," so must every faithful minister of Jesus and of his Gospel endeavour to do the same; otherwise, example being more powerful than precept, he will neutralize and pervert in his own mind and in the minds of those to whom he ministers whatever revealed truth he may orally proclaim. But the mere endeavour to *live* the moral and social precepts of Christ is so far from being recognized as a moral and social obligation on Christian ministers only, that it is, to a great extent, demanded of every citizen in this kingdom by the laws of our country, and of every intelligent and virtuous-minded man by his own cultivated perception and appreciation of their beneficial efficacy in the conduct of practical life. By the blessing of God on the progress of Christian knowledge and civilization, the principles and spirit and habits of thoughtful and virtuous men in our country and age are, to a great extent, brought into practical conformity with them; and, in consequence, while some persons are unable to discern the special source and origin of these moral and spiritual excellences, they nevertheless feel and confess that they *are* excellences, and adopt and apply them accordingly. Almost every enlightened and virtuous man in this kingdom, whether Atheist, Deist, Jew, or Christian—(I make the

assertion deliberately and advisedly)—acknowledges his obligation to contribute to the moral and spiritual elevation of the labouring classes of the community, to the education of their children, to the alleviation of their sufferings, to the supply of their urgent wants. He acknowledges, also, his obligation, to contribute to the utmost of his ability, to the diffusion of useful knowledge, the cultivation of temperate and provident habits, of a refined taste and discriminating judgment, the encouragement of friendly union and co-operation, in the community of which he is a member. This, therefore, cannot be reasonably and justly assigned as the *special and distinctive* office and work of the Christian minister, though it is unquestionably a necessary and indispensable part of his work.

The *special and distinctive* office and work of the Christian minister is, to maintain and exhibit the real origin and the divinely-sanctioned excellence of these and all kindred works of faith and labours of love. They are the fruits of that tree of life whose leaves are for the healing of the nations (Revelation xxii. 2); the root of which tree of life, therefore, it is the Christian minister's special duty to preserve and cherish. Imagine that root corrupted or destroyed, what reasonable hope can there be of the continued enjoyment of these blessed fruits? Hence to separate (as some men and even ministers are now doing) the practical applications of the Gospel from the Gospel itself, to preach (as others are doing) "Christianity without Christ," to substitute the external and visible and merely temporal results, for the cultivation of that inward spiritual power and faith which are to prepare us for eternity and to accompany us into it, is surreptitiously to withdraw from our modern Christian civilization its essential and vital spirit, and (however unconsciously) to betray the sacred trust committed to us, not for our own age and nation only, but for ages and nations distant and yet unborn.

I am setting before you, my friends, no imaginary case; but look at it as an imaginary case if you choose, and see what must, at no distant day, be its results. Your early religious culture and education were, I doubt not, based, as were my own, on the revelation of the Divine Will through Jesus Christ recorded in the New Testament.

You were early taught to discern the truth and reality of this foundation, and worked your way by patient and persevering inquiry through many difficulties which of necessity you had to encounter. Had this work been delayed to a more advanced period of life, it may be doubted whether your cast of mind, your habits of thought, your merely secularized tendencies, and your urgent secular engagements, would have allowed you either the desire or the opportunity to prosecute such inquiries at all. And such, I apprehend, will be the inevitable result of the preaching of Christianity without Christ, the separation of the secular applications of the Gospel from the Gospel itself, and the substitution of outward, worldly objects and institutions for the special and spiritual Revelation which it is the primary and distinctive office and work of the Christian Ministry to interpret, to maintain, and to promulgate.

In giving this clear and decisive utterance, as I trust it is, to my own conscientious and most sacred convictions, I am but endeavouring faithfully to discharge the duty which that most eminent of Christian ministers, the great Apostle to the Gentiles, distinctly recognised as incumbent upon himself, and which both reason and sympathy combine to urge upon me as equally incumbent upon Christian ministers of every age and nation. "We preach not ourselves," he writes to his Christian converts at Corinth (2 Cor. iv. 5) "but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." When I call to mind what an independent, self-reliant man was Saul of Tarsus, how strictly from his earliest years he had lived a Pharisee, how zealously and conscientiously he persecuted the followers of Jesus of Nazareth so long as he regarded him as a presumptuous deceiver who unwarrantably set himself up in opposition to the Mosaic dispensation and law, and then how he afterwards lived and laboured and died in and for the cause of this same Jesus as indeed the Christ, I cannot hesitate to accept, as carrying with it to my mind all the force of a moral demonstration, his clear and consistent and faithful testimony to the Divine mission and authority of our Redeemer and our Lord, or to avow my own clear and decided conviction that to preach Jesus as the Christ and

as raised from the dead by the mighty power of God, and his Gospel as the word of the Father who sent him, is primarily and distinctively that office and work of the Christian ministry which, in the spirit of Christian truth and freedom and love, I affectionately commend, my friends, to your intelligent and cordial reception, and on your faithful labours for the fulfilment of which I reverentially and earnestly implore the blessing of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

P.S.—The characteristic tendencies of the present day, in connection with all but material objects and merely secular interests, are in direct opposition to the principles in this Address avowed and maintained. An able critic in *The Fortnightly Review* thus clearly exposes them :—

"The general reader of the present day is fond of what may be called disembodied opinions that float in vapoury phrases above all systems of thought and action. He likes an undefined Christianity which approves itself to nothing in particular, an undefined education of the people, an undefined amelioration of all things : in fact he likes sound views, nothing extreme, but something between the excesses of the past and the excesses of the present. The modern type of the general reader may be known in conversation by the cordiality with which he assents to indistinct blurred statements. Say that black is black, he will shake his head and hardly think it; say that black is not so very black, he will reply, "Exactly." He has no hesitation, if you wish it, even to get up at a public meeting and express his conviction that at times and within certain limits, the radii of a circle have a tendency to be equal, but on the other hand he would urge that the spirit of geometry may be carried a little too far. His only bigotry is a bigotry against any clearly-defined opinion ; not in the least based on a scientific scepticism, but belonging to a lack of coherent thought, a spongy texture of mind that graduates strongly to nothing. The one thing that he is staunch for is the utmost liberty of private haziness."

NARRATIVES FROM REAL LIFE.

HARRIET S——.

From a letter addressed to Miss C., dated February, 18—

Poor Harriet has departed to her rest. Her warfare is accomplished,—her sufferings are ended,—her crown is won. She got worse than usual soon after you saw her, and continued to get weaker until the week before last, when she died. Did I relate to you her history? I found her, eight years ago, in a den of infamy,—friendless, ignorant, wretched, perishing. I visited her at the request of one of our friends; the 25th chapter of Matthew was read, the latter portion of which a good deal affected her. Becoming somewhat better, and anxious to leave the wretched abode in which she lay, she removed to lodgings in another part of the town; and although I made frequent inquiries after her, somehow I lost sight of her for two years; when one evening as I was passing down an obscure back court to visit a poor aged woman, a young female of clean appearance, but thin and wasted form, opened a door and asked if I would step in. I did so. The little room, though poorly furnished, was neat and tidy, and on a small table was an open Bible. "Surely," said I, "I have seen you before." "Yes, Sir," she replied, bursting into tears. "I am the poor miserable girl whom you visited at that house in Back Lane." "What! Harriet S——! Why, I imagined you to be dead." "No, thank Heaven! I am still alive; and oh, how often I have wished to see you! But I did not like to send, as I knew how much you are engaged, and I cannot get out." "Well, Harriet, I am glad that you are spared, and that we have met here,—but what are you doing? How are you going on, and how have you spent the last two years?" "I hope, Sir," she replied, "not unprofitably. When you found me, I was in ignorance and sin, not able even to tell a letter of the alphabet, but the Scriptures you read, and the advice you gave me impressed my mind, and I resolved to learn to read. So I bought a child's primer, and got on step by step, until I was able to read the Bible; and the reading of that Bible has been, I humbly hope, the means of

bringing me from darkness to light, and from sin to God." She, at the same time, spoke of her former course with the deepest contrition, and expressed her hope of the Divine forgiveness. You may imagine, dear Miss C—— how this news gladdened my heart; so we knelt down together, and I thanked God.

From that time until her death, she was almost entirely confined to the little bed on which you saw her lie,—often enduring the most excruciating pains, but never uttering a murmuring word, or encouraging a repining thought. When I have condoled with her under pain, she frequently said,—"Were my sufferings a hundred times greater than they are, they would be less than I deserve; but my heavenly Father is merciful, and will not break the poor bruised reed, nor lay upon me more than I am able to bear. My desire is, that whether ease or pain be my lot, his will, not mine, may be done." But you saw the frame of mind she was in. Soon after our visit to her, dropsy came on, and she suffered greatly. A short time before her death, I read the hymn you copied for her. "I would not live always," &c. She was much delighted with it,—said it expressed her own feelings, and spoke of that which she hoped to realize in the heavenly world. When the hand of death pressed heavily, she spoke of you, and desired me to give you her thanks, and her dying love. She departed painfully, yet happily,—depending on the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, humbly looking forward to an everlasting crown,—and is doubtless gone to the bright presence of Him to whom the cry of the perishing penitent was never offered up in vain.

A somewhat remarkable circumstance occurred in connexion with the death of Harriet. You doubtless recollect the old woman who attended her, and gave me the Bible to read when we called. Seeing Harriet's end drawing near, and the peace of mind she enjoyed, she said, "Oh I could wish to die with her, and be buried at the same time!" Her wish was granted. She sickened,—died a short time before Harriet,—and on the same day they were both carried to the grave!

A MOTHER'S INFLUENCE.

The youth argues about the worth of religion. There is, he feigns, no reality in it. It is a delusion, a pretence, without life, without power either to support the trials or virtues of men. But he leaves his companions, he is alone, he reviews the past, and his heart reproaches him for the words he has uttered. Far away, on the bright horizon of his early years, stands one like an angel of light, belonging both to earth and heaven,—one long gone, but whom he will never forget,—the form of the mother of his childhood. He can remember, how with a strange, sweet awe, when he could hardly understand the words she uttered, though he knew the affection which prompted them, he was awakened from slumber by the tones of her voice in prayer as she knelt by his bedside before she slept. He remembers the still Sabbath hours when she repeated to him the words of Jesus,—blessed words which he knew were in her heart. He remembers with what trusting resignation she bore affliction, and all her Christian gentleness and fidelity in trial, and her self-forgetting sacrifices for the good of others. He remembers how, struck by disease, she faded slowly away, cheerful when others were sad; how her soul dwelt upon the sweet words of Christian promise—how, when her child was alone with her, with fond tears that could not be repressed, she clasped him to her bosom, and raised his thoughts to heaven, and taught him to remember his Creator in the days of his youth. He remembers how her countenance was lit up with faith and trust, how in the hour of death, when all else wept, she alone was calm, and with her last whispered words committed his soul to God. He has seen a Christian mother live and die. He knows that hers was a soul that took hold on heaven. And as he remembers these things, all the scoffs of a world could not make him doubt the worth of religion. A still small voice from that mother's deathbed, and that mother's grave speaks to his soul, and he cannot doubt.—E. Peabody.

FOUR NEW AXIOMS.

An axiom, lexicographers tell us, is a self-evident truth. Such are those propositions which mathematicians place at the foundation of their science—so evidently true that no demonstration could make them plainer. Among them are the following:—"The whole is greater than its part": "Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another": "If equals be added to equals, the wholes are equal." Some writers, however, are disposed to make every position of their own party, and every crotchet of their own brain an axiom, worthy of universal assent, and against which there should be no appeal. In illustration let us quote the following from the *London Inquirer*:—

"We lay down the following Axioms as incontrovertible:—

"1. The Association *must* and *will* be kept open to include the various phases and tendencies of thought in our church.

"2. While it continues to stand upon its historical and recognised basis,—the profession of Unitarian Christianity,—it *must* and *will* leave every member to define for himself, what is Unitarianism and what is Christianity.

"3. The British and Foreign Unitarian Association is *not* going to be converted into a Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, nor is its Committee going to assume the functions of a Belfast Presbytery, to inquire into the 'soundness' of ministers, or the 'orthodoxy' of certain communications to our periodicals.

"4. We mean to be free,—devoutly, gravely, and religiously free; and if we are not to be free, as we have been hitherto, within the present Association, we shall either form a new one, or break the old one in pieces."

We are told that the Association must "include the various phases and tendencies of thought in our Church." Let us consider what those phases and tendencies are. Some believe in a Christ, and some in no Christ; some regard Jesus as their Master, others declare that he is no Master to them: the majority regard the Bible with reverence, but some look upon it as the great Fetish of the age: most of them believe in a personal God, but some affirm that the existence of a God cannot be proved. Now it is hard to conceive how any Association for religious purposes could embrace phases and tendencies so opposite; but *The Inquirer* tells us that the Unitarian Association *must* and *will* do so: its mandate may be, as it declares, "incontrovertible," but we are dull enough not to perceive it to be an *axiom*.

We are told that the Association, standing on its historical basis, will leave every man to define for himself what is Unitarianism, and what is Christianity. What is meant by "historical basis" we do not clearly understand: if it means the principles of the founders of the Association, we are quite willing to admit such a basis, and to adhere to it; but we know that by some juggling use of the term "historical" Independency has been shown to be Presbyterianism, and Christianity to be Deism; and, in the same way, the

basis of the Association might be shown to be no basis at all, which, we suspect, is what the writer aims at; for every man is to define for himself what is Unitarianism, and what is Christianity! Let us suppose that every freebooter in the United States was at liberty to define for himself what is loyalty and what is treason: or that every follower of our Lord could define for himself what was obedience and what betrayal:—then even Judas could have proved himself a true disciple! Such a proposition is not an *axiom*, but an absurdity. Still, Sir Oracle says it *must* and *will* be so; and we suppose that from his infallible utterance there is no appeal.

The British and Foreign Unitarian Association, we are told, is not to be converted into a Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, nor its Committee into a Belfast Presbytery. Certainly not; for then it must cease to be sectarian, and thus lose the distinctive character which its founders gave it as a *Unitarian* Society. But those Irish bodies place the Scriptures at the foundation of their organization; and we strongly suspect that such was also historically the basis of the Association. That the majority of its present members may cast aside the authority of the Scriptures, notwithstanding the care and cost that have been expended in issuing a Revised Translation of them, is quite possible; but still it is not an incontrovertible truth—*an axiom*.

The Inquirer and his partisans mean to be "devoutly, gravely, and religiously free;" and if they cannot be so, "they will form a new Association, or break the old one in pieces." About the devoutness, gravity, and religiousness of these desperate lovers of freedom there may be two opinions: that at least is not an axiom. But mark their liberality:—if they cannot get their own way, they will take their revenge. If discontented and wanton seamen cannot get the management of the ship, they will scuttle her; and if *The Inquirer* cannot bend the principles of the Association to sanction the wildest speculations of scepticism, he will do his best to destroy it. There is liberality with a vengeance! One thing is plain, though it be not an axiom,—that some of those who rant most loudly about freedom are at heart the most intolerant bigots.

AN IMPORTANT ADMISSION.

The *Unitarian Herald*, in its leading article of July 21, has favoured us with a notice, which is, in the main, not unfriendly, and which contains the following admission, to which we reasonably attach some importance:—

"We may briefly say, that we hold, no less than they (*The Christian Unitarian* and its supporters) that faith in the Divine mission of Christ is a requisite qualification for the ministry in the Unitarian Church. . . . We have always thought that the positive work of our Church is the maintenance of Christianity as a Divine Revelation through Jesus Christ, and contained in the Bible."

Now it strangely happens that these are the very principles, expressed in nearly the same terms, for the maintenance of which the ministers and congregations composing the Northern Presbytery of Antrim were constrained to secede from the Antrim Presbytery, and were subjected to unmeasured abuse in the columns of *The Inquirer* and *The Herald!* When we said that these two journals, "Herod and Pilate like," joined in a certain matter, we did not mean to suggest that either of them was characterised by wickedness or weakness, but simply that, while they had little love for one another, they were marvellously agreed in assailing those who would not sacrifice Christian principle to "absolute religious liberty." *The Herald* objects to any authority being exercised by a Presbytery. Well, there must be authority somewhere; and whether it should be vested in a Presbytery, or in the congregation, or in both, is a point about which good Christians have differed, and, we suppose, will continue to differ. Let us hope that our contemporary will hold to the admission it has so frankly made, and not seek to evade its obvious meaning by such an abuse of terms as casuists and sceptics employ, when they tell us that every man has a Divine mission, and that the children in a household are so many little Christs!

INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this Association was held at Boston, on May 10th; the President, the Rev. Dr. Stebbins, in the chair. After prayer the Secretary read the proceedings of the last annual meeting. This was followed by the treasurer's report. The President next read the report of the Executive Committee. He began by saying: We complete, with this anniversary, forty years since the organization of the association. It had hours of depression and gloom, but had emerged gloriously out of them all. After congratulating the members on the favourable auspices under which the anniversary was held, the report proceeded to speak of the work in which the association had been engaged. The Indian Mission, under the Rev. Mr. Dall, has a commendable degree of success. The British Government has made an appropriation, to be continued five years, towards the maintenance of his school. At an early day they hoped to send a missionary to the Pacific coast, to finally locate at some central place. Henry G. Denny, Esq., visited City Point, Petersburg, and Richmond. Rev. G. H. Bailey visited Alexandria, the camps and hospitals in and around Washington, preaching on Sunday, in the former place, to good audiences, with some prospect of forming there a permanent society. Rev. Charles Lowe and Rev. Calvin Stebbins went to Charleston, S.C., where they were welcomed by the loyal members of the Unitarian Church. Mr. Stebbins is now at Charleston, earnestly

engaged in his mission. Rev. Samuel A. Smith laboured faithfully for some time at Norfolk, until he was struck with disease, from which he has since died—an event which has filled the hearts of his people and the community with sorrow. As soon as a suitable man can be obtained, he will be sent to the South-west. The report then gave a full sketch of the successful effort to raise 100,000 dollars, and closed with a delineation of the work before them for the coming year, and concluded with these words: "Let us take up the work with a solemn resolve never to lay it down till all men shall be redeemed from ignorance and sin, and God be loved and adored. . . . Our prayer is that the great head of the Church, and God, the Father of all, will bless and keep us."

The Rev. Dr. Osgood, of New York, spoke of the worth of their literature, and the duty of spreading it. The Rev. H. C. Badger spoke of Starr King, his position in California, and the prospects of successful missionary efforts in that region.

The Rev. Charles Lowe spoke of the condition of South Carolina, and the Rev. Dr. Eliot of the wants of the West.

The Rev. Dr. Bellows spoke of the hopeful condition of their cause, and said it should lead them to the boldest action. They had got at the mind and will of the Unitarian body. Success in future calls for money would depend on the efficiency with which the present funds were spent. He hoped to see new churches established, and the Association should give itself to this and every useful effort which presented itself for the advancement of the cause. Referring to missionary work, he said—We must carry with us true Christianity: one which recognizes Christ. We do not want an emasculated Gospel. We should take the kernel of truth which is in Orthodoxy and leave the shell. We have the blessed Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; taking our stand on that, let us try to convert the world. The Gospel is not for any one class—not for the rich alone, or the poor, but for all. Those who represent our communion often lack passion, feeling, and sentiment. It is a fatal mistake to ignore these, and dwell only on the logical or intellectual side of religion. We must plant with hope in God, and labour with faith. We should not pride ourselves on our respectability. The great principles underlying our faith contained the very essence of the Gospel of God. This Unitarian denomination of ours had a grand and magnificent basis, and we should go forth with the claim that the world belonged to us, and needed us. To do this effectually we must recognise the uses and power of the passions. He was unwilling to speak of the understanding in the disparaging words of Hazlitt and Coleridge, but he would lay special stress on the power and uses of the feelings. We should not stand gazing at the temple and do nothing towards building a road to reach it; but at once spring to the task. Dr. Bellows, in this connection, urged the importance of using more of the emotional part of our nature in religion. We must address the passional element of the soul, or we shall fail. Those do not know human nature who fail to employ the great passions, and we have need to wake up to a consideration of this subject. This point was urged with vivid imagery and inspiring eloquence, and Dr. Bellows then closed his brilliant and stirring address with an appeal to the American Uni-

tarian Association, to reach out its hand and strike a telling blow in the land, for liberty, holiness, and love, and thus do a great Christian work in this age.

The discussion then closed, and the officers of the Association were elected. The Hon. J. G. Palfrey was elected President, and the late President, Dr. Stebbins, was appointed Secretary, with the view of making that office of more importance than hitherto. The salary of the Secretary was fixed at 2,500 dollars.

The collation which followed the business meeting is reported as unusually successful. More than a thousand presons were present at the table, and the balconies were full of spectators.

PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY OF LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE.

The Annual Meeting of this Assembly was held at Bolton, on Thursday, June 15. The religious services were conducted by the Rev. W. Gaskell, and the Sermon was preached by the Rev. A. M. Creery, from Eph. iii. 17, 18, 19. At the conclusion of the Service the Business Meeting was held, the Chair being occupied by the President, the Rev. W. Gaskell. The roll of ministers and delegates was called by the Rev. J. Wright, who acted as Secretary. Mr. Gaskell was re-elected President, and Mr. Wright was chosen as Secretary for the ensuing year.

In the absence of the Secretary of the Missionary Branch, Mr. H. A. Bright of Liverpool, the Secretary of the Assembly, read the Missionary Report, which stated that a steady progress was being made, and that with larger funds a more extended work could be accomplished. The Report was unanimously adopted, and a new Committee was appointed. Mr. R. Shipman of Manchester, being called upon to read the Report of the Minister's Salary Committee, said that, owing to the illness of the Secretary, and partly owing to the distress, the Committee had nothing to report, but that he wished to make a few remarks on the question. He found by the last Report that at present there were only thirteen students at college; in six years an average of two and one-sixth per year had entered the ministry; there were 250 Congregations in the kingdom, and suppose each minister served 25 years, ten new men were required every year to fill the vacancies. One-third of those educated at the Manchester New College, from ill-health or other causes, did not follow the ministerial profession. The Missionary board has sent out something like an average of four a-year; and taking these without deduction, there were only six a-year on whom they could at all depend, and of these only five could be reckoned upon as useful and energetic ministers to take pulpits or missionary work. The difficulty of supplying vacancies was becoming greater and greater every year, and one great reason was the inadequate remuneration of the ministers. Information had been asked from 51 places and congregations, and the result of 33 returns was that the highest salary was £500, and the lowest £27. The amounts raised by congregations (independently of endowments) varied from £687 to £5. 8s. The average of 32 salaries was £149, of the contributions £135, and of the endowments £44; the two latter exceed-

ing the salaries by about £30, which he supposed went to pay incidental expenses. Thirteen out of the 33 salaries were below £100. This Session only two gentlemen were entering the College, and the Missionary Board had admitted only four students. These facts showed the importance of taking any steps which might possibly lead more men to apply themselves to the work of the ministry. He proposed the re-appointment of the Committee, with power to add to their numbers. The Rev. H. Green of Knutsford, seconded the resolution, which, after some discussion, was adopted.

The Rev. W. Binns moved a series of resolutions in reference to the assassination of President Lincoln, which, being modified at the suggestion of the Rev. C. Beard, were adopted.

About 4 o'clock nearly 250 ladies and gentlemen including many influential members of the Unitarian body in the town, dined together. Alderman Robert Heywood of Bolton, occupied the Chair

---

THE GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCHES.

The General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches was held in Worship Street Chapel, London, on Tuesday morning, June 6th. The Rev. John Marten was called to the chair. The morning sitting was chiefly occupied in reading the church letters. At eleven o'clock a public service was held. The Rev. W. Matthew, of Hull, preached from John xv. 4, "Abide in me and I in you." The main ideas of the sermon were that a true church is spiritually united to Christ, and brings forth appropriate fruit as the result of that union. Our churches had busied themselves too much with the philosophy of Christianity and its errors of form, and too little with the faith itself considered as a gospel of regeneration. To regard Christianity as merely a natural power in the world—though a great and good one— and to deny its strictly Divine potency as God's select antagonist to evil, is virtual alienation from Christ. The resolutions passed had reference chiefly to the affairs of the churches comprising the body; but among them the following was passed:—"That this assembly, having in view the unsettled state of public opinion with respect to the Divine authority of Christianity, and the trustworthiness of that history of its Great Founder which is contained in the four Gospels, desires to express its unshaken conviction of the truth of those sacred records, which it earnestly commends to the devout and reverential study of all its members, and its recognition of the Lord Jesus Christ, not only as a perfect example of holiness, but as the Divine Master whose religious teachings we are bound to receive and obey."

The social meeting was held after tea, Frederick Dyer, Esq., in the chair, and was addressed by Revs. E. Hammond (who delivered a long and thoughtful address on the need and value of authority in religion), C. L. Corkran, J. C. Means, R. Spears, J. Marten, T. Rix, P. Bakewell, and J. Briggs. The speeches all bore upon the value of historical Christianity, and upon how the claim of Jesus Christ to the trusting discipleship of Christians remains unshaken by all that modern criticism and inquiry are doing. A very earnest and thoughtful tone characterised the proceedings.

MEETING OF THE NORTHERN PRESBYTERY OF ANTRIM.

This reverend body held a meeting at Ballyclare, on the 5th of July, 1865, for the visitation of the Northern Presbyterian Congregation of Ballyclare, and the transaction of other business. Agreeably to appointment at a previous meeting, the Rev. J. Scott Porter preached, and constituted the Presbytery by prayer. The Rev. Wm. Bruce, Moderator, then took the chair, and the roll was called; when all the ministers of the Presbytery answered their names. The Rev. Francis M'Cammon, of the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick, being present, was requested to sit and deliberate with the brethren, and complied.

In answer to the queries proposed by the Moderator, the minister, elders, and members of the Committee of the Congregation stated, that the Congregation numbers 101 members who pay stipend, the great majority of whom, (nearly all in fact,) are heads of families: that public worship is regularly conducted on every Lord's day, the average attendance being upwards of 100; that there were 90 communicants at the last celebration of the Lord's Supper; that there is a congregational Sunday-School with an average attendance of 6 teachers and 33 pupils; that the minister's salary is £100 per annum; of which the stipend contributed by the members of the Congregation amounts to £71 5s. 6d. The Session Book, the Committee Book, The Treasurer's Account Book, the Register of Baptisms, the Register of Marriages, and other official documents were produced, and found to have been carefully kept.

In answer to the Moderator's inquiry whether there was any point respecting which the Congregation wished for the advice of the Presbytery, or in which its assistance could be useful,—the Commissioners stated that they wished for advice and help in reference to the procuring of a permanent place of worship; the building in which they now assemble being held only from year to year, and being fitted up in a temporary manner. Several members of the Presbytery dissuaded the Congregation from making any move at present towards the erection of a new meeting-house, inasmuch as their present place of worship, though rather small, is neat and commodious; and for other reasons which seemed to make a change undesirable at this time.

Several members of the Presbytery having expressed their gratification at the flourishing condition of this worshipping society, and addressed words of exhortation and encouragement to the people, of whom a considerable number were present, it was resolved unanimously,—"That the Presbytery feels bound to record its high satisfaction with the favourable report which it has received of the state of Northern Presbyterian Congregation of Ballyclare."

Some routine business having been transacted, the Rev. CHARLES J. M'ALESTER begged to call the attention of the brethren to the assassination of the President of the United States, and to propose a resolution expressing the feelings of the Presbytery on that occasion. While a variety of opinion existed in this country on the subject of the recent war in the United States, the sympathy of some being with the Federals, and those of others with the Con-

federates, he trusted that the earnest hope of all had been, that the oppressed might be set free; to his own mind that hope was the one ray of light that gleamed over all the dark scenes of suffering, death, and tribulation which so terribly characterised those years of warfare. He believed that although neither of the great contending parties aimed at the emancipation of the slaves in commencing the war, President Lincoln most heartily desired it, and seemed to recognize the providence of God in bringing about so glorious a result. With the feeling that peace had been restored, and that in a little time the blight of slavery would be removed from the land, he must have felt more than rewarded for all his labours and anxieties; but, in the hour of triumph, a base assassin struck him down, and plunged the country into mourning. When the sad tidings reached us, a feeling of deep sorrow and indignation filled the public mind. By a rare firmness and benevolence President Lincoln seemed peculiarly fitted for the responsible position which he held, and there was little reason to doubt that, had he been spared, the country would rapidly have settled down into tranquillity, and general confidence would have been restored. He begged to move a resolution expressing our abhorrence of the crime which deprived the American people of their President, our sympathy with them in their bereavement, and our earnest hope that, with returning peace, the best energies of the nation may be devoted to secure for all classes and sections of the people the largest freedom and the greatest happiness.

The motion was seconded by the Rev. James M'Ferran. All the brethren having expressed their concurrence in its object, some conversation took place respecting its form; when it was the general opinion that the feelings of the Presbytery should be embodied in a resolution, to be forwarded to the American Ambassador in London, for transmission to his government; and the following was unanimously agreed to, viz.:—

"That at this our first meeting since the lamented death of His Excellency Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America, we feel called upon to record our detestation of the atrocious act of assassination by which he was cut off in the midst of his days and of his usefulness; our participation in the sorrow of the surviving members of his family under the sad loss which they have thus sustained; and our sympathy with the people of the United States, deprived of their high-minded chief magistrate, at the very moment when his invincible firmness and undaunted fortitude had been rewarded with a success more complete than usually attends the wisest of human counsels: and when, from his lofty character, there was reason to expect that moderation in victory and that merciful forbearance towards a vanquished enemy, which, accompanying the glorious emancipation of the slave, would have for ever associated the name of Lincoln with that of Washington, as the inaugurator of a new and happy era in the history of his country. And that we desire to express our earnest hope that the Government and People of the United States will employ their utmost efforts to consummate the great victory which they have achieved, in the manner most consistent with Christian principle, most accordant with the soundest policy, and best corresponding with the dignity of a great and magnanimous nation."

The Rev. J. Scott Porter then said that he thought the Presbytery, whose members had always been distinguished for their attachment to the principle of education free from creeds and tests and all sectarian influences, ought not to separate without placing on record its deep regret at the inroad on that principle which appeared to be contemplated by Her Majesty's Government, with reference to that noble institution, the Queen's University in Ireland. That University sprung out of the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, which had been previously founded by Act of Parliament, and which were by law precluded from making the profession of any particular creed or doctrine, or connexion with any ecclesiastical body, a condition for holding any office or gaining any honour which they had to bestow. It was the object of the University to enable young men so educated, to gain those academic ranks and degrees which were in some cases necessary to the exercise of their profession, and in all casess were the recognized testimonials whereby it was understood that those who bore them had received a liberal education. He maintained that the University was bound to adhere to the same fundamental principle; and it was with dismay that he had read speeches lately delivered by Sir George Grey and Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, avowing that plans were under consideration by which either the power of conferring degrees upon its own students would be conceded to the Roman Catholic University, a strictly sectarian seminary, or by which it should be affiliated and connected with the Queen's University. Mr. Porter argued that the latter plan would necessarily lead to a change in the constitution of the Senate of the Queen's University similar to that which had been made in the Board of National Education; by which it would become virtually a sectarian institution,—that it would lead to the affiliation of other seminaries founded by other churches and tied up strictly to their creeds and formularies, that these measures would have a most disastrous effect on the truly liberal and enlightened Queen's Colleges, by drawing away the students of almost all the various churches and sects from their class-rooms, and thereby endangering ultimately their very existence;—and that the result of the whole would necessarily be the separation of the youth of Ireland into a number of distinct educational establishments, each having its distinctive creed and colour, instead of training them in habits of mutual respect and love. Mr. Porter concluded by moving, "That we have learned with deep regret of certain statements made in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for the Home Department and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, from which it appears that a plan is in contemplation by which the highest academic distinctions in connexion with the Queen's University in Ireland shall in future be awarded to students who have been educated in strictly sectarian seminaries and under strictly sectarian auspices: that we deplore the adoption of any measures for accomplishing that purpose, as adverse to the principles of united and non-sectarian education on which the Queen's University was founded; as calculated to weaken the influence of those principles throughout the country; and ultimately to destroy the efficiency of those admirable institu-

tions, the Queen's Colleges, which have already conferred such important benefits on Ireland."

The Rev. Francis M'Cammon seconded the motion. He had always looked upon the establishment of the Queen's Colleges as one of the noblest acts of the late Sir Robert Peel's administration; and was sorry to see their fundamental principle in danger of being compromised. He regretted that the principle of non-sectarian education had been infringed upon by the National Board, in reference to the training of teachers; and would regret its abandonment, with respect to the young men receiving a University education. He regarded the plan intimated by her Majesty's Government with reference to the affiliation of the Catholic University as unnecessary, because students educated there could, if they pleased, obtain degrees under the regulations of the University of London.

The Rev. Classon Porter did not object to the resolution as it affected the Queen's University; but he thought the present Government had been unfairly charged with inconsistency with reference to the Board of National Education. The fact was that National Schools had long been *de facto* sectarian institutions, and were so regarded in their respective neighbourhoods:—the Church school, the Presbyterian school, and the Catholic school, though all connected with the National system, being commonly known and spoken of as such: and the Government were guilty of no inconsistency in acknowledging this undeniable fact.

The Rev. C. J. M'Alester stated that it was to be regretted that in many localities such was the case; but it was contrary to the whole genius of the system as originally founded. The present motion, however, did not in any way touch upon the management of the National Board; and he thought it ought to pass without a dissenting voice. The motion accordingly passed unanimously.

The Presbytery then adjourned.

The members of Presbytery and a considerable number of the members of the Ballyclare Congregation dined together in the large room of the principal hotel in the town. Several able and interesting speeches were made which our space does not permit us to report. Among the toasts was the health of "the Rev Dr. Montgomery," which was proposed with much feeling, and most cordially responded to by the whole meeting. The meeting, which was altogether of a most gratifying description, separated at an early hour; many of those present having considerable distances to travel before reaching their homes.

OBITUARY.

On July 6, at the residence of her son-in-law, Henry Crook, Esq., Ravenswood, Bolton-le-Moors, aged 67 years, Elizabeth Agnes, widow of the Rev. George Harris, of Newcastle-on-Tyne.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] SEPTEMBER, 1865. [No. 8.

OUR PULPITS—HOW ARE THEY TO BE FILLED?

THE question has often risen during the last twenty years to those most interested in the support and spread of Christian Unitarianism in Ulster—"How are our pulpits to be filled?" and latterly that question has pressed itself with painful urgency; for the candidates for the ministry in our church have gradually become still fewer; and as ministers, from age or failing health, are compelled to resign, there seems every reason to apprehend that none may be found to take their places. Some five or six years ago the matter occupied the serious attention of the Non-Subscribing Association, while yet the bodies of which it was composed worked together, very much as one church; but even then the elements of discord, which subsequently resulted in the disruption of the Presbytery of Antrim, and the withdrawal of several congregations from the Remonstrant Synod, were at work, and to some extent thwarted plans that were laid down for remedying the evil, and increasing the number of students for the ministry. An effort was made to create a fund for the assistance of young men of good character and of fair abilities, who desired to enter the Christian ministry: to some extent the effort was successful: but some ministers strongly opposed this plan, alleging that the only plan by which it could be expected that candidates for the ministry would be increased, would be largely to augment the income of ministers; and that then young men, who are now attracted by the more liberal remuneration which other professions offer, would be found willing to undertake the preaching of the Word. How far some who argued

thus were actuated by hostility towards the prominent advocates of the scheme for assisting students we cannot say; but there is no doubt that personal enmity has thrown the most bitter ingredient into all our discussions and divisions. An education fund was raised at that time, but as most of the opponents of the scheme discouraged their people from contributing, the amount raised was much smaller than it should have been, and the aid afforded to students was comparatively trifling. Still it worked well, and showed the wisdom of those who established it. The supply of ministers has, however, continued quite inadequate for the demand; and at the last annual meeting of the Remonstrant Synod the subject was seriously discussed, and a deputation was appointed to bring the matter before the Committee of the Non-Subscribing Association; and that committee, after much consideration, agreed to a resolution recommending that, where it seemed desirable, an effort should be made to induce congregations to increase their contributions for the support of the ministry; and they further resolved to afford more liberal assistance to young persons who were preparing for the ministry in connexion with the Non-Subscribing Association. We believe that these resolutions were wisely adopted, and we are only surprised that any should have supposed that an effort to create an education fund would clash with measures for augmenting the stipend of ministers, or would in any way interfere with it.

It is right that ministers should receive from their people a liberal support. They are expected to maintain a high social position, to contribute freely to cases of distress, and to charitable institutions and religious objects, to purchase books calculated to increase the efficiency of their pulpit ministrations, and keep them up with the increasing knowledge of the day, and besides, to support their families in respectability. Putting aside the consideration that much time and money have been expended on their education,—time and money which, invested in any other profession, or in any trade, would render them a much larger return in worldly emolument,—they cannot meet the many demands on their purse,—no matter how prudent and self-denying they

may be,—with an income of seventy, eighty, or one hundred pounds, or even one hundred and fifty pounds a year. It should be borne in mind that the relative value of money has greatly altered within the last twenty or thirty years, and that an income which, some years ago, might have been a competence, would now be quite insufficient. There are, at this moment, many tradesmen and mechanics that are earning a larger income than our most honoured and most efficient ministers, while the position in which they live requires a much smaller expenditure; and many of those who imagine that they are liberal in the stipend which they pay, give ten times as much to their cook, their stable-boy, or even to their shoe-black; while in our country congregations some of the "leading members" will waste more at a single market or fair than they give in a year for the support of their minister. Pleading as we do for liberality towards those who minister in the Word, we do not, as some have done, place the ministry in competition with other professions. We think it has been to the serious injury of the Established Church in Ireland, that some of its offices have been so largely endowed; for they have been often filled by parties who have little heart for the holy work, and no claim for preferment, save that which rank and interest give them. We hold that men should enter on the ministry because they have a love for it, and earnestly seek to discharge its noble functions and solemn responsibilities. We cannot place it on a level with the various professions which offer so tempting a prize to ambitious youth. But while we contend that candidates for the Christian ministry should be actuated chiefly by a love for the office to which they aspire, they should have the prospect of a respectable support; and to all the anxieties and discouragements which necessarily belong to the office, especially in Unitarian Churches, there should not be added the fretting and humiliating annoyances which spring from straitened circumstances.

In any effort that may be made to augment the stipend of ministers who are insufficiently paid, we are strongly of opinion that laymen, and not ministers, should act. It is not the province of ministers to plead in a matter of this kind for themselves, or for one another. We conceive

that they put themselves in a wrong position when they undertake such a work. Laymen may, without incurring a charge of selfishness, undertake the matter, and, if they enter on it in the generous spirit which should animate them, they are sure to accomplish much good. It needs no persuasive eloquence, no colouring of the imagination, but a simple statement of facts; let them show what is the position of a minister, and what the claims upon his scanty income; let them show how needful for the interests of religion and of their families is a Christian ministry,—and ask that all in a family who are earning,—not the venerable grandfather only, but father and sons,—should give according to their means for the support of an institution to which they owe, or ought to owe, so much. There is no one connected with any of our congregations, whether master or servant, employer or employed, who should not contribute according to their means to sustain the worship of God.

But it may be objected that some of our congregations are so small or so poor that it is impossible for them to afford anything like a competent support for a minister. True: and in such cases we think that the strong should help to support the weak. Christian men from Christian motives contribute liberally to sustain the preaching of the Gospel in heathen lands; why should not those in our Church who have the means, give freely for the ministrations of the Word in our own land? There is no portion of our country where there are even a dozen persons holding and prizing Christian Unitarian views, to which we should not minister by occasional preaching, and the stated administration of the Lord's Supper, as well as by the service of baptism, and the visiting of the sick and the afflicted; and ministers who have the work of the Gospel at heart will cheerfully give their time and labour to such additional duties.

In any scheme for forming a sustentation fund for the aid of weak and poor congregations, and in any systematic efforts for supplying small societies with preaching, it is obvious that the Non-Subscribing Association cannot act as one Church: the tie by which the several bodies are associated for purposes in which all Irish Non-Subscribers are alike interested, is too loose to form an ecclesiastical

bond. The principles on which two at least of the bodies are based, are entirely distinct; one—the Presbytery of Antrim,—making "absolute religious liberty" its foundation; and another—the Northern Presbytery of Antrim,—the divine Mission of Christ, and the authority of Scripture, with perfect freedom in its interpretation. In efforts therefore to help struggling societies, and in all missionary work, the several ecclesiastical bodies must act separately. There was a time, not long past, when a greater unity of sentiment prevailed among them, and when, without any compromise of principle, they might have heartily co-operated in endeavours to support the weaker congregations, and to preach a free Gospel wherever opportunity offered! but, divided though they now are, the duty nevertheless presses on each of the bodies, according to its ability, to sustain and extend the cause of religion.

But, in order to aid and encourage young persons who have a sincere desire to engage in the work of the ministry, it is proposed to give increased grants towards defraying the expense of their education. Kindred churches have long acted on this plan, and it has been instrumental in bringing into the ministry many of those who are now standard-bearers in the army of the cross. Manchester New College allows a sum of *Five Pounds* monthly to such students—candidates for the ministry—as pass satisfactorily a prescribed entrance examination, and in addition to this allowance, the class fees are also paid for them. A smaller allowance is made to students in the Home Missionary Board, but still enough to enable young men of very slender means to prepare themselves for the pastoral office. In the United States of America similar aid is given, both in the Cambridge Divinity School and in the Meadville Theological School; the former granting a sum of *Fifty Pounds*, and in some cases even more, to deserving students, and the latter, which is of comparatively recent establishment, allowing *Sixteen Pounds* a year to beneficiaries, with tuition and the use of the Library free. With these examples before them, and with the knowledge that the plan has operated successfully, it is strange that any opposition should have been given to its adoption by the Non-Subscribing Association. We trust that liberal encouragement may be

given to those in our churches who desire to devote themselves to the preaching of the Gospel. It is alleged that some will avail themselves of the aid afforded in order to obtain a Collegiate education, and then turn to some more lucrative calling. Possibly it may be so: but if, as we presume, they have been led seek the aid of our Education Fund, that they may become fitted for the ministry, the chances are that no tempting offer of worldly success will divert them from their holy and settled purpose: and if any should desire to turn to other pursuits, by all means let them do so: the Church is better without ministers who are not heart and soul devoted to their work. Some say that by affording facilities for an humbler class to enter the ministry, we lower the office, and introduce into it men of uncouth manners and of narrow and bigoted views. We have only to say in reply, that some of our most valued ministers now, and in a past generation, have risen from an humble position; but they have been neither the less able, nor the less acceptable on that account. And even if the accent of some may be wanting in refinement, the words of Gospel truth, will not, on that account, come less forcibly from their lips. Other preachers of the Gospel, in an earlier age of the Church's history, sprung from obscurity, yet their pleadings for Christ and his Word reached many hearts and influenced many lives. As to narrowness of views prevailing in the humbler ranks of life, we are not sure that in our Churches it is so, while there we are as likely as in a higher rank, to find Christian faith and fervent piety. There are some people in our day, wise and liberal they think themselves, who stigmatize as narrow and bigoted all who do not endorse their own sceptical opinions, but such opinions are the misfortune, and threaten to be the ruin of our Churches. We think the Association has acted wisely in determining to augment the aid they have hitherto offered to deserving students; we believe they would have acted more wisely, if they had made it still larger; and we trust that there may soon rise up, whether from a higher or lower rank is of little moment, men well furnished for the ministerial work, and fitted to be the successors of those who now occupy our pulpits.

THE LITTLE CANDLE.

Cheerful the little work-girl sat,
And swift her needle flew,
While the dark shadows of the night
Their gloom around her threw.

A little light alone was hers,
As there she sat and wrought;
And well she knew how dear to prize
What her own toil had brought.

"I must be quick," she musing said,
"My little candle wanes,
And swiftly must my task go on
While yet its light remains."

And then she plied, with wondrous skill,
The little shining steel;
And every ray of that small light
Smiled on her patient zeal.

Ere the last glimmer died away
Her task was neatly done;
Sweet was her rest, and joy to her
Came with the morning sun.

Ah! is not *life* a little light
That soon will cease to burn,
And should not we from that dear girl
A solemn lesson learn?

While yet our little candle shines,
Be all our powers employed;
And while we strive to do our tasks,
Life shall be best enjoyed.

But let us ne'er, in darksome hours,
Forget what Christ hath done,
But patient, in sweet hope, await
The glorious rising sun.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.

(*Continued from p.* 230).

IV.—JOHN LEWSON,* the fourth Minister of Cairncastle, was ordained there in 1728, and continued minister of that parish until his death, in 1803, thus completing a ministry of 75 years in one congregation, a fact which is perhaps unprecedented in the history of any church. During the first six years of this period, Mr. Lewson was assistant to his predecessor, Mr. Taylor, who did not die until 1734. During the last ten years of his ministry he was assisted by his successor, Thomas Alexander, who was ordained in Cairncastle, in 1793. Mr. Lewson, who in many respects was a remarkable man, and who made for himself a local reputation which is not yet entirely obliterated, was a native of Dunmurry, where he was born in 1706, and was consequently only 22 years of age at the time of his settlement in Cairncastle. He was educated at Glasgow College, where he seems to have paid more attention to his studies than did the majority of his fellow-countrymen at that seat of learning; for his granddaughter informs me that he always read the Old Testament Scriptures in their original Hebrew, a circumstance which was impressed upon her mind by the singularity of her grandfather's reading the Bible backwards. The same kind friend also states that "Mr. Lewson was from the first a Unitarian," but what particular phase of religious doctrine that word *then* indicated, or indeed what it indicates *now*, it would be very difficult to determine. Mr. Lewson was most probably ordained to the pastoral charge of Cairncastle by the Presbytery of Antrim, which was then only two years in existence, and of which Mr. Taylor, his predecessor, was one of the original members. But the absence of any Presbyterial records for this particular period prevents me from stating this fact positively; and, strange to say, the first

* For most of the information which I have been able to collect respecting this most estimable man and his family, I gratefully acknowledge myself to be indebted to his worthy granddaughter and my kind friend, Miss Shaw, formerly of Ballygally, now of London.

subsequent available authority, viz., the Book of Minutes of the Synodical Presbytery of Templepatrick for 1745, shews that in that year the Congregation of Cairncastle was connected with that Presbytery, and consequently had returned to the General Synod of Ulster, after a stay in the Presbytery of Antrim of less than 20 years. The precise date of this change I cannot give, not having access to the Synodical records which alone could determine it. But this apparent relapse was probably caused exclusively by considerations of local convenience, and did not of necessity imply any doctrinal reaction on the part either of Mr. Lewson or his congregation. The Presbytery of Templepatrick, which was constituted in 1725, was always exceedingly lax in its formula of subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, even during the time that it required such subscription at all, which was only during the first forty years of its existence; for on Feb. 3, 1765, it formally, and by express vote, did away with subscription to the Westminster Confession altogether, in any shape or form. So that Mr. Lewson, although a Unitarian, would be perfectly at his ease in this liberal body. The first entry, however, in the old Minute Book of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, in which Mr. Lewson's name is particularly mentioned, shews that he was not left entirely without Presbyterial supervision and control. "On Feb. 10, 1747, at Templepatrick, Mr. Lewson is appointed a Common Head on the question, how Christ advocates the cause of believers at the throne of grace." The fact of a minister being appointed a piece of Presbyterial trials twenty years after his ordination, struck me as so unaccountable, that on first reading the foregoing entry, I was inclined to think that it must refer to Mr. Lewson's son, who died young, and who, I thought, might have been then passing through his father's Presbytery, on his way to the ministry. But a comparison of dates shews that this cannot have been the case; and, therefore, we are constrained to believe that it was the veritable minister of Cairncastle himself, who after having discharged the duties of the ministry for twenty years, was at that period required to give to his brethren a proof of his continued retention of his original gifts.

Whether it would be desirable in general to revive this old-fashioned practice in the Presbyterian church, it would ill become me to say; but in this particular case of its application to Mr. Lewson, it is gratifying to read that "on April 14, 1747, at Larne, Mr. Lewson delivered the Common Head as was appointed, and was approved." About the same time, however, the conduct of the minister of Cairncastle in another particular did not appear to his brethren to be equally commendable, and did not escape their condemnatory notice. At the meeting held "August 9, 1747, at Craigfergus, the Presbytery, in pursuance of former resolutions, agreed to proceed to censure such members as habitually absent themselves from the Presbytery, according to the discipline of the church, and appointed Mr. W. Thompson (Larne), to intimate this resolution to Mr. Lewson;" which seems to have had the intended good effect upon Mr. Lewson's subsequent attendance at Presbytery. On many occasions, he was also accompanied by an elder, and I may as well here give the names of the persons who are set down as attending meetings of Presbytery in that capacity from Cairncastle, during the period of Mr. Lewson's active ministry, *i.e.*, from 1728 to 1793; adding their respective residences, so far as I have been able to ascertain them:—

1747-1759.—Mr. William Johnston had the corn-mill and farm at Ballyrudder, and was probably the husband of Dorothea Margaret, the second daughter of Rev. W. Taylor, the third minister of Cairncastle (see p. 229). This family is now locally extinct.

1747.—Robert Steel, formerly of Corkermain, now of Sallagh.

1750.—Andrew Wilson, not known.

1750-1759.—John Lusk, formerly owned Kimmercam, now of Killyglen.

1750-1757.—Robert Caldwell, Tobergell; still there.

1751.—John Brown, Ballygilbert, at "the Thorn;" now extinct.

1751.—Patrick Lorimer, of the Droagh, now extinct in Cairncastle.

1755.—John Craig, the Drains; now extinct.

1755.—Joseph Hunter, then and still of the Minniss.

1756.—Samuel Brown, of that part of Dromain which is owned now by the Richards family.

1774.—Archibald Tweed,* of that part of Dromain, which is now owned by Dr. Kirkpatrick.

* The respectable family of the Tweeds, of Cairncastle, came originally from Scotland, as indeed their name would sufficiently indicate.

In 1749 there came before the Templepatrick Presbytery a case in connexion with the Congregation of Cairncastle, which I may be allowed to notice as furnishing an instance of the jurisdiction exercised in those times by Presbyteries over their Congregations, which, I suppose, would scarcely be submitted to in the present day :—

"1749, FEB. 7.—At Larne. The Committee (of Presbytery) met in Cairncastle since last meeting, and report that Mr. ROBERT MATHYS,* sen. and jun., THOMAS PANNELL, GAWIN ROBISON, and JOSEPH HUNTER (all then of the Minniss, in the north end of Cairncastle), though all Dissenters, did not worship with them.

One branch of the family settled at the Hill-head, on the Ballygally estate, where its representatives still continue. Of this valuable farm they got a lease in perpetuity about 1770 (as did the Wilsons and others at the same time) from a Dr. M'Cullough, who took forcible possession of the Ballygally estate, and adopted this iniquitous method of raising money to maintain at law his unrighteous usurpation against the youthful heir, Mr. Shaw of Ballygally. Another member of the family,—John Tweed,—settled at St. Cunning, or Ballyrudder, in Cairncastle, which he had to leave for voting against Lord Antrim in the great contested election of 1760, and bought a lease of Ballycoose, where his descendants continue to reside. This John Tweed was greatgrandfather of my worthy friend, the present John Tweed of Weyburn, in Cairncastle.

* The MATHEWS family owned, for a considerable period, a small estate in the north end of Cairncastle, which comprised the townland of Drumnagreagh. Where they came from I cannot tell, most probably from Scotland ; neither can I give any account of their settlement in Cairncastle, unless a Rev. Lemuel Mathews, who in 1694 was Prebendary of Cairncastle, and who, in that year, was degraded from his office, was the local founder of the family. In 1722, the name of Robert Mathews of Cairncastle appears among the signatures to "the humble representation to the General Synod of Ulster of certain gentlemen of the Presbyterian persuasion." (See p. 225.) In 1740, or thereabouts, the same gentleman is set down in a paper drawn up at that time for the Earl of Antrim's rent office, as being "worth sixty pounds per annum in lands," no inconsiderable property in those days. In 1761, Robert Mathews of Drumnagreagh joined with James Tullis of Corkermain in signing the lease of the Cairncastle meeting-house, probably because he had a mortgage against the estate of the lessor, Mr. Tullis. But in the course of a few years the fortunes of the family were changed, as have been those of too many Cairncastle families both before and since. The last head of the Mathews family left no legitimate representative; and, bequeathing his estate to trustees for the benefit of a nephew who resided in Scotland, and one of his trustees proving unfaithful to his charge, his heir, on finally getting possession of the property, found it to be so hopelessly encumbered that he sold it to the Macnaghten family of Bushmills, who again exchanged it, some years ago, together with other lands in Cairncastle, with the Earl of Antrim, for lands which the Antrim family held near Bushmills, and it is now part of the Antrim Estate.

These persons not being present, the sexton of Cairncastle was appointed to summon them to this meeting, and show cause why they did not worship with the Congregation of Cairncastle, nor contribute to the support of their minister. The sexton now appears, and attests that they were accordingly summoned, but not one of them now appears save Joseph Hunter, who now alleges that neither his father's family nor his had ever considered themselves as members of the Congregation of Cairncastle, but of Glenarm; that at Mr. Thomas Brown's settlement (in Glenarm) he had joined in the call, and became a bondsman for the stipend, and that part of his farm was in the parish of Glenarm. The Presbytery reasoned long and seriously with him, and sent particular ministers to deal with him, but all to no purpose. The Presbytery having heard all he could say, declared it to be their opinion, that inasmuch as he lived within the parish of Cairncastle, and that the stipend of that Congregation was paid by the land,* he ought to contribute to the support of the Congregation of Cairncastle. As to the other persons who did not appear, it was declared that none of them communicated at Glenarm for several years past without certificates.† As to Mr. Robert Mathys, the Presbytery wrote a civil letter to him, laying before him what arguments they judged should prevail with him, to contribute to the support of the Gospel in Cairncastle, urging that a gentleman of his good sense and influence ought to be an example to others in this matter."

I fear that the people at the north end of Cairncastle made good their point against the Presbytery, for their representatives to the present day continue to worship in Glenarm.

In 1759 was held in Cairncastle the first of a long series of Presbyterial Visitations, of which that Congregation was the scene and subject. The records of all these visitations my space will not allow me to give, but as a

* The Presbyterian landowners in Cairncastle, such as the Shaws of Ballygally, Blairs of Blairmount, and others, bound their tenants in their leases to pay a portion of their rent in the shape, and under the name, of "stipend to the Protestant Dissenting minister" of the parish, as, in a previous Memoir, we have seen was done by the Agnews of Kilwaughter. In a lease from Mr. W. H. Blair of Blairmount to a tenant, dated Feb. 2, 1772, the lessee is bound "to pay to the Dissenting minister of Cairncastle the sum of 3s. per annum, with a day's ploughing, and three loads of turf, or the value thereof, over and above all taxes and subsidies, quit rent and crown rent excepted."

† These certificates were granted by the Minister and Session of Cairncastle, which implied that the persons exhibiting them were still regarded as being properly members of the Cairncastle congregation, although, from considerations of local convenience, they were allowed, on the strength of these certificates, to communicate occasionally in Glenarm.

specimen, I give here the first, which may be interesting to some of my readers :—

"1759, MARCH 12,—At Cairncastle. A visitation. Elder from Cairncastle, John Lusk. Messrs. Mackay and Sinclair* being present, were asked to join and give their votes, and consented. Mr. Lewson preached from Psalms cv. 2, which was considered and approved.† Mr. Thomson (of Larne) had informed the Congregation of Cairncastle of the Presbytery's intention to visit them as this day. James Clarke, Thomas Wylie, and Archibald Tweed appeared as Commissioners from the Session of Cairncastle; and from the Congregation appeared Captain W. Blair, Messrs. Tullis and W. Johnston, Commissioners,‡ who being asked how Mr. Lewson performed the duties of his station as a Gospel minister, informed the Presbytery that he was very diligent and faithful, and that his Congregation were well satisfied with him in every respect. The Commissioners from that Congregation gave also a very good account of Mr. Lewson's session, as men of sobriety and faithful in the duties of their office, and Mr. Lewson informed the Presbytery that his Congregation in general gave due attendance upon public worship, and were, he hoped, improving in knowledge and virtue. The Presbytery called for a stated account between Mr. Lewson and his Congregation, and were informed that there was not any prepared. The Commissioners complained that the method of paying stipend to Mr. Lewson, and not to collectors, which the people of Cairncastle had generally fallen into, involved them in perplexity, and put it out of their power to know how the stipend was paid. Mr. Lewson also complained that this method of receiving the stipend was very troublesome to him. The Presbytery, to remove these difficulties, proposed that collectors should be chosen, to receive the stipend from the people, and pay it into the hands of some one man, who should pay it to Mr. Lewson, and state accounts with Mr. Lewson and the collectors annually. This proposal was

* These gentlemen were members of the Presbytery of Antrim, and ministers respectively of the congregations in Belfast and Larne which were connected with that body.

† In old times, the *pastor loci* was invariably required to preach in his own pulpit on occasions of Visitation Presbyteries, in order that the brethren might have audible proof that he had not neglected the gift that was in him, and which had originally been given by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.

‡ Respecting Messrs. James Clarke and Thomas Wylie, I have not been able to ascertain anything. Respecting the other Commissioners here named, the reader of these Memoirs has already all the information which I have procured, or which he would care to know. Concerning the Blairs of Blairmount, who for many years occupied a position in the parish of Cairncastle second only to that maintained by the Shaws of Ballygally, see Memoir of Larne and Kilwaughter, (*Christian Unitarian*, ii. 162, note); observing, however, that the present owners of Blairmount estate are not, as is there stated, descended from the original proprietors, even through the female line, but hold exclusively by purchase, and although of the same name, are not, I believe, of the same lineage as the Blairs of Blairmount.

agreed to, and the following persons were elected to be the collectors; viz., Mr. John Shaw (of Ballygally), Captain W. Blair (of Blairmount), Archibald Tweed, Samuel Brown, Robert Caldwell, William Sheriff,* Robert Brown, and Mr. Johnston. And Mr. Farriss† was chosen Treasurer, from whom alone Mr. Lewson is to receive the stipend, so long as he continues Treasurer or head collector. It was recommended to Mr. Lewson and his people, that their accounts should be stated as soon as possible. This they engaged to do."

The reader will find that this matter of accounts between Mr. Lewson and his Congregation occupied a large space in all subsequent Presbyterial visitations of Cairncastle, where at last it assumed dimensions of a truly formidable character.

In the mean time, I may mention that shortly after the date of the foregoing visitation, viz., on July 29, 1761, a lease was executed by "James Tullis of Corkermain, in Parish of Cairncastle, Gentleman," conveying "to John Shaw (Ballygally), W. H. Blair (Blairmount), and John Lewson and their heirs, for ever, all that acre of land whereon the meeting-house of Cairncastle stands, situated in Corkermain, with said meeting-house, and other houses thereon, with all appurtenances, to hold for ever, absolutely, without any condition, redemption, or reservation whatsoever, yielding and paying therefor yearly unto said James Tullis and his heirs, for ever, a seat in said

* In 1772, a man called William Sheriff got a valuable lease in perpetuity of lands in Drains, from W. H. Blair of Blairmount. There was also a "William Sheriff of the Howe," as well as a family of the same name at Carnfunnock in Cairncastle, now the residence of its proprietor, James Agnew, Esq., but which of them was the person named in the text I am not able to determine. The name of Sheriff is now, I believe, extinct in the parish of Cairncastle.

† This man lived at St. Cunning, in the north end of Cairncastle. His son, Charles Ferris, obtained, in 1772, a valuable lease, for lives renewable for ever, from W. H. Blair of Blairmount, of certain lands on the Blairmount estate. This Charles Ferris was the father of the late Dr. Ferris of Larne, and consequently the granduncle of the present Dr. Charles Ferris of Larne, my good friend and physician. In the foregoing list of names, the reader may observe a nice appropriation of designatory epithets, which in former days were not indiscriminately awarded as they are now. A landed proprietor, or person in the position of a gentleman, was always called "Mr."; whilst to a tenant, or occupier of land, no distinction whatever was given, his Christian and sirname alone being mentioned. With us, they would all be "Esquires;" but a remembrance of the fact which I have now stated is often useful to guide us to a knowledge of the real social position of the persons who lived a hundred years ago.

meeting-house worth ten shillings yearly, according to the common estimation of seats in said house, for the use of said James Tullis, his heirs and successors, and also the further yearly rent of sixpence, when demanded." This lease is entirely in the hand-writing of Mr. Lewson, who, indeed, in addition to his purely pastoral duties, wrote nearly all the leases as well as all the wills connected with the parish of Cairncastle. Many of these documents I have seen, and I must say that the clear, bold, and distinct hand-writing, not only in the body of the documents, but almost invariably in the signatures, puts to shame the degenerate penmanship of the present age of National Schools. In addition to the lessor, and three lessees above mentioned, the lease of Cairncastle Meeting-house was, as a further security, also signed by Mr. Robert Mathews of Drumnagreagh, for a reason to which I have already alluded. One of the attesting witnesses to this lease was Thomas Higginson, who was then, and for many years Clerk of Cairncastle Church; and whose descendants now occupy a very respectable position in America, the land of their adoption. In Cairncastle,—"the place that once knew them, knows them no more."

PROGRESS OF NON-SUBSCRIPTION TO CREEDS IN THE CHURCHES OF SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND.

We have never for one moment hesitated in our conviction that the great principle of Non-Subscription to human Confessions and Articles of Faith, is destined, sooner or later, to overspread the Christian church. It is true we never looked for its speedy, much less its immediate triumph; but we never doubted that its triumph would come; and we doubt it now less than ever. We see the cloud rising, not bigger than a man's hand; but it is charged with many a refreshing and fertilizing shower, and those who look with apprehension to the effects it may produce, would do well to get their chariots ready, and hasten out of its way.

The late meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, was characterized by much that was

narrow-minded, exclusive, and repulsive. The majority of the ministers who were present as the representatives of their respective presbyteries, appear to have been selected with a view to their possession of these qualities; and they certainly displayed them in great perfection. But still there were some members of the reverend court, —spirits of a superior order and a finer mould,—whose enlightened Christian liberality on some of the questions which were discussed at the meeting, contrasted most favourably with the narrow views of their brethren by whom they were surrounded and overborne;—and facts were elicited which shew that, among the *laymen* in communion with the Scottish Church, there is a growing dissatisfaction with the Confessions and Catechisms which have been imposed upon the Kirk as its rule of faith;—a dissatisfaction, in many instances, grounded upon *an avowed dissent* from the doctrines which these creeds embody;—and in many more, resulting from a conviction that, whether those doctrines be true or false, the laws requiring subscription to them, as qualifications for office or membership in the church, are unchristian and tyrannical; and ought to be resisted and repealed.

We look with hope to the exertions of such men as Norman Macleod and Robert Lee. They may not go as far, nor half as far, as we are prepared to go ourselves: still they are moving in the right direction; and, so far as we can walk together, we are glad to have them for fellow-travellers and companions. These men are evidently doing a great and good work in the Church of Scotland; and,—far from joining in the outcry which some Unitarians would gladly raise against them, because they do not at once abandon their position in the kirk, and take their lot with some nondescript body of separatists, or form a new one of their own,—we rejoice that their consciences enable them to stay where they are, and to fulfil a duty which can be much more effectually performed within the established church than outside its pale. We doubt not that in time, their labours, and those of men of a similar stamp, will bear fruit.

A fact which was admitted by both sides, in the course of the debate on a motion brought forward by Dr. Lee, (it was a motion for repealing an Act of Assembly which

requires all the elders in the different church courts to subscribe the Westminster Confession of Faith), shews that their exertions and those of several eminent men who preceded them, have not been altogether ineffectual. It was asserted, and not denied, that in *upwards of one hundred parishes* in Scotland, there is *no existing kirk session, nor the possibility of organizing one;* because no person can be found, qualified by character, intelligence, and social position, for the post of elder, who would consent to subscribe the Confession of Faith; a step which an old Act of Assembly,—*not an Act of Parliament,*—rendered indispensable, as a preliminary to the exercise of that office! When we consider that the whole discipline of the church, as constituted by law, depends upon the existence of the parochial session or eldership,—that without such a body the arm of the Presbytery, the Synod, and even of the Assembly itself, is in some cases paralysed,—we can readily conceive that infinite pains would, in every such instance, be taken to prevent the extinction of these primary courts; and when, in upwards of one hundred parishes out of 1200, such efforts have proved unsuccessful, we must believe that the principle of non-subscription to the Westminster standards of belief has already made great progress among the respectable and intelligent classes of Scottish society. It is evident that the laity in that country look upon subscription as a yoke upon the neck and a burden upon the conscience; and we trust the day is not far distant when the clergy,—though they are generally the last to repudiate such chains,—will view it in the same light, and will refuse to be the instruments of imposing it upon their lay brethren, and upon each other.

We now turn to the Church of England, and cannot refrain from congratulating the bishops, the clergy, and the candidates for orders in that Church, on the passing of the Act respecting clerical subscriptions, which received the royal assent towards the close of the last session of Parliament. This Act has made a great, and, as we hope and believe, a fatal inroad on the Act of Uniformity by which the subscriptions and declarations hitherto in force were prescribed or sanctioned. Under the law, as it formerly stood, all clergymen at ordination

were compelled to sign the following subscription, viz :—"I, A. B., do willingly and *ex animo*,"—(that is, *from my heart*),—"subscribe to the Three Articles imposed by the Thirty-sixth Canon,"—which Articles were,—1, a declaration of the King's supremacy in all causes, and over all persons, ecclesiastical as well as civil; 2, a declaration that the "Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church," contained *nothing contrary to the Word of God;* and thirdly, a declaration that "the Book of Articles, *and all and every the Articles therein contained*, being thirty-nine in number, were *agreeable to the Word of God.*" This was stringent enough, but for further assurance, every beneficed clergyman, at induction into his living, was bound to declare openly and publicly before the congregation, assembled in church for public worship, his "*unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything* in the Book of Common Prayer contained and prescribed."

These subscriptions and declarations are now abolished, and in lieu of them the following declaration is substituted :—

"I, A.B., do solemnly make the following declaration. I *assent* to the Thirty-Nine Articles of religion, and the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe *the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland*, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God: and *in public prayer and administration of the sacraments*, I will use the form in the said Book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

The deviations from the former strict and stringent declarations which are found in this new formula, are many and manifest. The awfully solemn words,—"*willingly*,—*ex animo*,—*unfeignedly assent and consent*,"—are swept away: and instead of them a mere declaration of "assent" to the Articles and the Prayer Book, and a promise to use the latter on certain specified occasions, together with a profession of belief that the *doctrine of the Church of England and Ireland, as therein set forth*, is agreeable to the Word of God,—are all that is now required. Now it is evident that the word "*assent*" alone,—without its accompanying term, "*consent*,"—does not *necessarily imply belief*. A man may *assent* to a *formula*,

in the sense of *agreeing that it shall be used*, without binding himself to every statement which it involves: and this distinction will, we suspect, soon be found out, and put to use, by persons who will be called upon to take the declaration. No doubt a profession of belief is required; but it is no longer "a willing and *ex animo* subscription, *to all and every one of the Articles*,"—nor an "unfeigned *assent and consent* to all and *everything contained and prescribed* in the Book of Common Prayer,"—but simply a declaration that the person who takes it "believes the doctrine of the United Church to be agreeable to the Word of God." If we assume "the Word of God" to mean the Scriptures,—as here it manifestly does,—the declaration might be signed by one who believes neither the doctrine of the church nor the teaching of the Bible. He might disbelieve them both;—and yet be convinced that they agree with each other. Even those whose scepticism may not extend so far, may raise endless cavils on the question what is "*the doctrine of the church?*" It is evident that the phrase is not intended to signify "*all and every one of the Articles*,"—"*all and everything contained in the Prayer Book*"—for those terms are studiously avoided and thrown aside. They must therefore be taken to signify *so much of the contents of the Articles and Prayer Book* as expresses the *prevailing*, or, it may be, the *universal opinion*, of the church. If this be not the meaning of the Act, it would be difficult to shew a sufficient reason for discarding the old and unambiguous terms;—and if this be their meaning, it will be difficult to convict any clergyman, no matter how heretical he may become, of a breach of his ordination profession and vow. As to the promise to use the Prayer Book,—it is strictly confined to occasions of Public Prayer, and the administration of the Sacraments. The Sacraments are Baptism and the Lord's Supper only. The future clergy will therefore be released from all obligation to use the *Church Catechism*, with its undisguised assertion of the real presence, and its salvation by the sacraments;—the form of *Confirmation*, with its blasphemous declaration of the power of a bishop to communicate the Holy Ghost;—the *Marriage Service*, with its coarse indelicacies;—the *Visitation of the Sick*, with its priestly absolution from

sin ;—and the *Burial Service*, with its "sure and certain hope of a resurrection to eternal life" of the vilest and most enormous sinner at whose interment it is read.

It may indeed be said that some of those distinctions are more fitting for a Jesuit than a clergyman of the Church of England. We are not now concerned to argue that question. All that we affirm is that arguments and exceptions of the very same nature have been put forward in some recent legal discussions, and have been allowed full weight by the highest courts and judges in the land. We doubt not we shall, in time, see a very considerable relaxation in the barriers which at present keep many learned and conscientious men outside the pale of the church by law established in these lands; and on the prospect of so desirable a consummation, we heartily congratulate both its clergy and its members. Meanwhile, we watch and wait.

R.

THE GRAVES OF THE YOUNG.

In the burial-ground which adjoins our place of worship lie the remains of two young persons connected with our Congregation, who died within a few months of each other. Though close to a large, bustling, and noisy town, the resting-place of our dead has a quietness and seclusion which a stranger would hardly expect in such a locality. It forms a square of some sixty feet, lying on the northern slope of one of the chalk hills that overlook the town, and commands, over the tops of the subjacent houses, a view of the broad tideway of the M——, with the huge vessels that slumber on its quiet bosom, and of the wooded hills that lie beyond. The ground is enclosed with walls facing the four cardinal points, and is skirted on the south by a public road, little used except by foot passengers, and on the west by a lane, too steep for any but the smallest and lightest vehicles; and even these rarely attempt to pass along it. Into each of these public ways a gate opens; and gravelled paths lead from these gates to the door of our neat unpretending house of prayer,

which occupies the north-western corner of the enclosure. The path from the west gate which opens into the lane is shaded by "locust" or acacia trees, planted by an old member of the Congregation, who procured them from the late Mr. Cobbett (of whom he was a great admirer) some twenty years ago, so that they have grown up to a considerable size; and when the bright summer sun is shining, they form, with their light elegant foliage, a very agreeable shade. Shrubs or flowers are planted around the graves; and it is pleasant to stand on the green turf, beside some mound which tells of a sleeper below, and look out over the broad river and wooded hills beyond, or around on the grey stones which bear the names and ages of the hallowed dead, and express, in prose or verse, the griefs of bereaved relatives, or admonish us of our mortality, or remind us of that better land, where those who have trusted in the Lord Jesus will meet again never more to be separated.

In this quiet resting-place our two young friends were laid. Louisa —— was the first. She was only sixteen, but remarkable womanly in appearance and figure for her years. A few months before she had, with her father and mother, joined our church. We were all interested in Louisa, for she was one of the steadiest and most thoughtful of our Sunday scholars, and the youngest of our church members. She had been for some years a scholar in the Sunday School at Bethel Chapel. We had then no Sunday School in our own place; and for some time after our school was re-established, her attachment to her teachers and school-fellows induced her to continue there, though her parents had been from early childhood steady attendants at our place of worship. We used no inducement to her to leave, for we believed she was getting good; and, I doubt not, that to her instructors at Bethel she was indebted, under God, for much of the sedateness and piety which marked her character. About twelve or eighteen months before her death, she thought she would come to our school, and she became a member of my Bible class, where she was distinguished always by her steadiness and attention. Others might surpass her in quickness; but none in thoughtfulness and a desire to improve.

She had been, for some months before her death, in service with a family of our congregation, and in this situation her faithful discharge of her daily duties attested the reality of her religious profession. The levities in which too many young persons indulge, especially in a town abounding, like ours, with seamen and soldiers, received no countenance from her example: she could be cheerful without violating maidenly modesty and propriety. It will not be wondered at then, that she was respected by us all, and that we all felt interested for her; and I believe all felt sincerely grieved when her unexpected death was made known. She was taken with a malignant fever, and in a few days was a corpse. Her mother, who was in London at the beginning of her illness, hurried home at the intelligence; but could only watch over the last two or three days of her existence, and close her eyes. It was on Thursday she died; and as, from the nature of the complaint, an early interment was desirable, she was committed to the dust on the following afternoon. It was a dreary autumnal day, at the end of October, and the cold grey sky and sere and falling leaves harmonized with the sadness of our feelings, as we paid the last duties of piety and affection to her remains.

The winter came on,—the snow covered for a time the cold bed in which she had been laid to sleep, and then melted before the warmer breath of spring. The primrose put forth its pale star-like blossoms around the grave, and the violets imparted their sweetness to the breezes that swept across her resting-place. Again and again the grave opened to receive its tenants; the grey head was laid low, and infants, like faded buds, were brought to be laid in the ground, accompanied by the sobbing anguish of maternal affection. The soft breezes of spring were succeeded by the ardent heat of summer, and once more the funeral train drew nigh to lay another young Christian, Sophia ——, in the "narrow house appointed for all the living." She had been observed to droop for some time:—the quick eye of affection noted the pale cheek and the failing strength: but love could not arrest the decline which it mourned to observe. Fever came on to do its awful work on her already ex-

hausted frame, and, with fever, occasioned delirium; but in the lucid intervals, the clear utterance of faith gave indication of her preparedness to depart; and her self-forgetting affection led the dying girl to console her weeping relatives, especially her mother, and to strengthen them to meet their coming bereavement. A few days of suffering, and she died, and was buried.

> "Unveil thy bosom, faithful tomb!
> Take this new treasure to thy trust;
> And give these sacred relics room,
> To slumber in the silent dust."

Sophia —— did not, properly speaking, belong to our Congregation. She, and all the members of her family, belonged to another church; but they were led to our place of worship at one of our special services just after they settled in the town; and I included them in my round of pastoral visiting, as though they had been members of my flock. Sophia and an elder sister taught in our Sunday School, and were most valuable co-operators with us in that work; and her three younger sisters were and are among our most attentive and constant scholars. We always counted on the presence of Sophia at our social meetings; and her quiet course of unobtrusive piety commanded our cordial esteem.

They sleep within a few feet of each other. The beams of the autumn sun fall on their resting-places, and the autumn flowers bloom around. No costly monument rises to mark the place; but an adjacent inscription on the enclosing wall of the ground points out where Louisa —— is laid. Their humble station and quiet unobtrusive deportment attracted little of the world's notice; and it was only just in their own circle that their removal was felt. But they are among the many instances in which divine grace has wrought its work of santification in the low ranks of society. To give refinement to those who have had little of literary culture,—to dignify an humble position by earnest piety and the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit,—to bind together the members of a little circle of whom the busy world little recks, by the bond of a self-denying affection,—these are the triumphs of the Gospel, and the ever-receiving proofs of its divine

original and heavenly power. The system which thus adorns and elevates the soul cannot but be of God. Who but He could have thus met the spiritual wants of the cultivated intellect of a Channing or a Chalmers, and the humble attainments of Louisa and Sophia? It is sweet to recal the memory of departed worth, and to pay to it the tribute of deserved commendation; and it has been a source of satisfaction to pen this record of two believers so early called to their heavenly home. Let me hope that it will not be without its use to the living. Perhaps some young heart may be inspired with, or strengthened in the desire and resolution,—"I, too, will be a Christian." Reader! what say you? Will you not tread the same path of duty as these young people? Perhaps you have attainments and abilities which they had not; advantages of education which they never enjoyed; a position and influence which they never possessed. Will you not be as diligent in improving your two talents as they were with their one?

They rest together; they will rise together, for not always will death hold his captives.

> "Grave, the guardian of our dust!
> Grave, the treasure of the skies!
> Every atom of thy trust
> Rests in hope again to rise!
> Hark! the judgment trumpet calls!
> Soul! resign thy house of clay,—
> Immortality thy walls,
> And eternity thy day!"

And with how much surer hope may those who have thus given their youth to God look forward to that rising, than those who have spent their days in inferior pursuits. What comfort for the dying pillow is like Christian faith? What will avail in the day of account but genuine piety? What voice of approval is to be compared to that of the Saviour,—"Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

J. C. M.

ADDRESS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

My Christian Friends,—I know not that I can more clearly and concisely explain my position and purpose in the notice which I gave at our last annual meeting than it has been already explained and vindicated, without any consultation with myself, by my highly-esteemed friend, the Rev. J. Panton Ham, in *The Inquirer* of June 24, and subsequent numbers; and to him I desire hereby publicly to acknowledge my obligations for his justly discriminating statements and arguments. You have, however, a right to expect that I should speak for myself, and this I therefore propose now to do as concisely and clearly as I can.

The British and Foreign Unitarian Association was originally formed "for the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad"—(Rule 1.) At the time of its formation, the meaning of both the terms by which the object of the Association is herein expressed was clear and definite and undisputed. Christianity was universally maintained by Unitarians equally with Trinitarians as the distinctive designation of the belief in Jesus as the Christ, in his mission and inspiration and doctrine as immediately and specially divine, and as carrying with them a direct Divine authority. The difference between Unitarian and Trinitarian was simply a difference of interpretation of what both parties equally reverenced as an immediate and special revelation from God through Jesus Christ; it involved no difference of opinion at all respecting the character of the revelation itself. When (as occasionally happened) some members of the Unitarian denomination, ministers as well as laymen—whether members of this Association or not I am unable positively to affirm—saw reason to doubt, and ultimately to reject this view of Christianity, they honourably withdrew from our denomination, and renounced the Christian name; because they distinctly saw that they could no longer adopt it in its primary meaning, and that if it were emptied of that primary meaning there remains absolutely no word in our language by which the recognition of the direct and special Divine mission and autho-

rity of Jesus as the Christ of God can be expressed at all. And such is still the judgment and the usage not only of all our orthodox fellow-Christians, but also of intelligent and upright men, who conscientiously reject the Divine mission and authority of Jesus of Nazareth, and, therefore, consistently avow themselves Jews or Deists, as the case may be, and would think it folly and fraud to call themselves Christians, though they are individually as observant of all the demands of Christian morality as if they acknowledged that Divine mission and authority. This I affirm from my own personal knowledge, and after much careful inquiry: so that general usage still maintains the definite etymological and historical meaning of the word Christian and its correlatives in their primary sense, notwithstanding the endeavours which are being made by a section of our small denomination to empty them of that primary meaning. I resist those endeavours on the very principle justly laid down by a writer signing himself "J. J. T.," in the *Theological Review* for July, 1865, page 405, whose words are as follows:—"We must earnestly protest against this theological juggling with words. It is a most unhealthy sign of the times. It tends to render the language reserved for the highest themes utterly meaningless, and to foster the too prevalent notion that theology is a vain talk about nothing." In requiring, therefore, that the meaning of the terms "Unitarian Christianity" should be clearly defined, I am simply giving a practical application to this just and earnest protest, and resisting the theological juggling which, if unopposed, would in no long time annihilate theology altogether.

In the exercise of my own free thought, I have been for many years past a member of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association for the Promotion of the Principles of Unitarian Christianity, as originally defined by those terms, and as still defined by them according to all but universal usage. The recognition of the special Divine mission, inspiration, and authority of Jesus as the Christ, and of his doctrine as not his own, but the doctrine of the Father who sent him, has been essentially involved in those principles, and I hold it still. But throughout the past year I have had forced upon my

notice the fact that many members of the Association employ the expression "Unitarian Christianity" in a sense directly antagonistic to that which alone I can rationally accept and desire to recommend. Can I then conscientiously continue a member of an Association which involves such "theological juggling?" Certainly not. Why, then, did I not quietly withdraw? Because I thought that I might thereby be doing injustice to a very large number of my fellow-members, who might perhaps be quite as earnest in their rejection of this theological juggling, when made aware of its existence, as I am myself. Hence the appeal which I have made is in no spirit of dictation or of hostility to any man or to any body of men; but simply that I may preserve my own integrity, and at the same time may not unwarrantably impute to the Association in general views and principles which it is quite possible that they may not entertain.

It seems to be a prevalent opinion with many of the new and (as they style themselves) advanced school of Unitarians, that to associate for the recommendation to others of our own clear and definite convictions is to impede the progress of free inquiry and the search after truth. On the contrary, I am fully persuaded, both by reason and experience, that such association, where it is perfectly voluntary and free, *as ours is*, encourages progress and aids the discovery of truth, just in proportion to the clearness with which its principles and objects are defined and maintained. By clearly and definitely avowing and recommending to others our own convictions, we do not at all seek to *impose* those convictions upon them. We simply appeal to the minds of our brethren in the conscientious exercise of their own individual freedom. Our language is,—"These are our characteristic opinions and the grounds on which they rest. Look at them, examine them, and judge for yourselves. To us they seem both true and important: we therefore commend them to your serious and candid consideration." Do we utter any denunciation or anathema against those who cannot accept them? Do we allow or cherish any feeling of hostility towards them? Assuredly not. Ought we, then, to give indefiniteness and haziness to the statement of our opinions and arguments for the purpose of winning such persons

over to our sect or association? I again reply, Assuredly not.

In this view of the necessity and value of distinct and separate association, I am supported by both the sentiments and conduct of the late excellent Dr. Channing, who is very mistakenly cited by the Rev. James Freeman Clarke, U.S., in his Address on Fellowship between those who differ about Miracles, as sanctioning the very opposite principle. Writing of the Hicksite Quakers, Dr. Channing declares :—

"In what I have said I mean not to condemn. I want more extensive knowledge of the views of this body of Quakers. I simply mean to say that, as a Unitarian, I have no disposition to identify their cause with my own, and for this simple reason, that we differ in some important respects. I can greet them as friends and brothers, just as I greet all good and pious men of all classes of Christians. I can and do rejoice that they have thrown off the bondage of human creeds. I hope much from the spirit of inquiry which is at work among them. But I have fears too, and I must say, many fears. I fear that they may prefer what they esteem a particular inspiration communicated to themselves to the everlasting and universal lights of reason and of the Christian revelation. I fear that a false standard may gradually supplant the true ones. I shall rejoice to find that I err. But it seems to me not wise to expose ourselves to misapprehensions by seeming to ally ourselves with those concerning whom we cannot but fear."—(*Memoirs of Channing*, vol. ii., p. 467. London : John Chapman. 1848.)

Precisely on this very principle, and because I object to certain opinions and tendencies which are very nearly identical with those which Dr. Channing here distinctly repudiates, I will not expose myself to misapprehension by seeming to ally myself with those concerning whom I cannot but fear. Gladly and earnestly will I continue to co-operate with those members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association who distinctly recognise the sole deity of the One God our Father, and the special divine mission, inspiration, and authority as a religious teacher of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But with those who give such an interpretation of the terms "Unitarian Christianity" as excludes the devout recognition of these distinctive fundamental doctrines, I cannot conscientiously permit myself to be associated; inasmuch as such an interpretation involves opinions which are diametrically opposed to my own, and which seem to me as

mischievous as they are erroneous, threatening reaction of a most injurious kind. In expressing this determination, and my resolution to give it practical effect, I am not in the least presuming to dictate to any man, or to condemn him for differing from me. My language to every man with whom I come in contact is still what it always has been, as many of my correspondents can testify, "Follow your light; but if that which is light to you be darkness to me, do not suppose that I cherish any sentiment of hostility or alienation towards you in my heart, if I honestly avow that I cannot go with you, but must take for myself, it may be, the very opposite path if my own light so lead me."

Trusting that I have now succeeded in giving distinct and unambiguous utterance to my own conscientious convictions, I cannot but maintain the resolution which I have avowed to act in intelligent and honest conformity with them, under the assurance that thus only can I escape condemnation myself, and place myself in that spiritual harmony of faith and obedience with what I believe to be the Divine will, in which alone I can reasonably hope for the correction of my errors, and for my own advancement and the advancement of others through my labours, in knowledge, virtue, and piety.—Believe me, Christian Friends, faithfully yours,

SAMUEL BACHE,
Senior Pastor of the Church of the
EDGBASTON, *7th August*, 1865. *Messiah, Birmingham.*

LETTER FROM THE REV. J. P. HOPPS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN."

SIR,—I see in your August number, a reference to an article in *The Truthseeker* on the late motion of Mr. Bache at the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. You speak of my "altered opinions," and refer to my tract, "What do we, as Unitarian Christians, believe?" in a way that would lead strangers to infer that I had bidden the truths therein expressed farewell. I am not going to engage in any controversy on this matter. I simply wish to say, in all kindness, that you really do not understand my position. I love the great truths you name as dearly as you do; but I am unwilling to see the old blunder committed, of

basing an Association of Christian men on the dogmatic and official statement of them. It never has answered, and it never will. The moment you begin to construct terms of admission, you must contrive a method of discipline or exclusion, and we know what that leads to. If I held all the views that Mr. Bache is supposed to hold, I should still respectfully but firmly oppose every attempt to make the dogmatic statement of those views the ground of Christian fellowship; and, in doing this, it seems to me that I should have everything to gain,—that, in fact, this would be good worldly policy as well as good ecclesiastical polity, for officially-pronounced formulas have never kept heretics out, while the spirit and the life of a community often have. This is vague, you will say. Perhaps it is; but it points to what, after all, is our true safety,—not an official formula, but an attracting and repelling spirit. Let us open our doors never so wide, and only some spiritual or mental necessity will bring men in. Let us close them never so zealously, and no earthly power will be able to keep the designing out.—Heartily yours,

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

DUKINFIELD, *August 12th*, 1865.

[We have much pleasure in publishing the foregoing letter, as it is written in a calm and candid spirit. Still, as Mr. Hopps is disposed to admit, it is vague, and it throws no new light on the question to which Mr. Bache's resolution has given rise. If to base the Unitarian Association on dogmatic views be a "blunder," the blunder has been already made, for its founders rested it at least on the Unity of the Godhead, as opposed to the Trinity; and although such a basis, distinct and prominent as it was, may not have kept out Trinitarians, yet, if we can conceive that any Trinitarians joined it, their particular views must have been suppressed; the Association, neither through it publications, its preachers, nor its missionary efforts compromised its Unitarianism, or subordinated it to an "inclusive" policy, or a vague and unmeaning liberality. Nay more; Christianity itself, as propounded by its author and explained by his apostles must also, from Mr. Hopps' point of view, be a "blunder," for it rests on a distinct dogmatic basis,—the admission of Jesus as the Christ; and, while some enlightened men in our time have strangely enough arrived at the conclusion that Christianity is nothing more than love to God and love to man, Paul, in words that now rise into marvellous significance, has forcibly declared,—"Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus CHRIST."

We are much pleased to find that Mr. Hopps still holds the opinions concisely put forth in his excellent tract,—"What do we, as Unitarian Christians, believe?" We presume that he intended

that tract to exhibit not his individual opinions merely, but the opinions of the denomination, as far as he understood them; for he intimates that it is designed to meet the objections of those who fancy that Unitarianism is a denial of Christ, and of all Christian doctrine. But, if Unitarian Christianity be an undefined and undefinable system, how can any inquirer know what it is, and how can there be any combined and hearty efforts to spread it? For consistency's sake, the Association is called on to define what the objects are for which it has been organized. As it is, the members are placed in a false position. Till very recently all the members believed that God was one person, not three; that Jesus was the Christ, specially sent from God as the revealer of his truth; and that the Scriptures contained the revelation which God thus vouchsafed to mankind. If the majority of the present members do not hold these views, or do not regard them as essential in Unitarian Christianity, then let them plainly tell us what is Unitarian Christianity. A clear and intelligible statement on this subject will meet all the purposes of Mr. Bache's resolution. If the statement be a distinct avowal of the divine mission of the Saviour,—well; and if it be such as will sink that fundamental doctrine, and exhibit such a system of negation and sentimentalism as will win the approval of the most sceptical and deistical,—well. Men will know, as at present they cannot, what they are associated to promote, and they can, as conscience may prompt, either remain in the Association or withdraw from it.

It is perfectly true that no dogmatic basis will exclude hypocrites; men may attach themselves to an association, although they disbelieve its fundamental principles; and in such a case we have no discipline to apply, and we wish for none; but it is right that men should know what are the objects for which they unite and subscribe, else it might turn out that they are giving their money and their influence to overthrow doctrines which they value as the truth of God.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

INTELLIGENCE.

FREE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, NEW SWINDON.

The fourth year of Rev. F. R. Young's ministry in connexion with the Free Christian Church, New Swindon, came to a close on Sunday, July 30, on the evening of which day, after a sermon from

Isaiah xxxii. 20, "Blessed are ye that sow beside all waters," he addressed the Congregation as follows :—

"Such are some of the thoughts suggested to my mind by the blessings which the Prophet pronounced upon those who "sow beside all waters." And as those thoughts have arisen within me, I have been compelled to remember that our present service ends another, and the fourth, year of our meeting together, as a congregation, in this place of worship. Those years have been brief, startlingly so, in their duration; and yet, if you and I could but have before our gaze all the hopes and fears, all the joys and sorrows, all the good and evil, they hold within them, we should see that no less a time than the eternal future could show forth the results which they have wrought.

"When this Church was first of all erected, its chief design was to provide a meeting place in which men and women who do not in all things agree with each other on matters theological, should, nevertheless, be able to join their spiritual hands together as they knelt at the common throne of the common Father, and offered their prayers and praises and thanksgivings to him who has been revealed to us, in all his fulness, in the Lord Jesus Christ. *Another* design, too, was to provide a place in which persons who had come to doubt the eternal verities of religion, and of Christianity, might yet be able to listen to Christian words, without having to bear the frowns and ill-will of their fellow-mortals, and where they might see that a Christian's faithfulness to his own personal convictions is compatible with the freest charity towards those who doubt or disbelieve. The results, so far as the eye of man can see them, are before you. A congregation has been gathered beneath this roof, meeting as free worshippers, and with the perfect understanding that we do not, and, in all probability, never shall, completely agree in all points of faith, however much we may be, and are, agreed in that "spirit of truth" which can unite men of divers opinions, as a society of worshipping Christians. The wanderer from God, and from himself, has come here; and has heard the voice of the shepherd seeking his lost sheep, and has at length come back into the fold he was so foolish as to leave. The troubled and disconsolate have come here; and the burden has become lighter, and the clouds have become less dense, and the way of life has become less dark and rough; and, in the strength of the food they have found here, they have gone on their journey for another forty days. The puzzled and perplexed by creeds and systems have come here; and found that Christianity is not so much a creed as a life, and that the greatest of all heresy is not a wrong opinion but a false life. The sturdy and earnest believer in the right and duty of private judgment has come here; and found his claim to that right and duty asserted and defended. The doubter has come here; and found that some of the very doubts he had been told were "devil born," were just such doubts as a healthy moral nature ought to have; and he has also found that the only doubts upon which the frown of God rests are those which arise from a heart in love with sin, and unwilling to see the truth which alone can make us free. The scoffer has come here; and found

that, not by contempt and derision, but by a truthful spirit and a generous love, can the truth of things be known, and our fellow-men be justly judged. Yes, and there are those now sitting before me, and listening to these very words, men and women, who before the opening of this Church were "without God and without a hope in the world," outside of all religious organizations, and out of sympathy with all religious opinions. They are here now, I say; and I indulge no indecent feeling of pride when I say that their hearts are, at this moment, bearing witness that the change which has come over them has been for the better and not for the worse, and that they and their families will have cause for many a long year to bless the Providence which brought them within these walls.

"And now, perhaps, some of you, and especially those of you who do not periodically worship here, may be inclined to ask, why I, of all others, should make such statements as I have just now made? My answer is that they are true, and that they ought to be known; first, for our own encouragement; and, secondly, that they may give the lie to those who represent us as a company of unbelievers, engaged chiefly in pulling down things that are venerable, instead of building up men and women in a Christ-like and holy faith. We have had our share, and more than our share, of misrepresentation; but I can assure you that such things do not move me, at least to the extent of making me desirous of giving up the work which God has committed to my hands. With life and some share of health, I hope to continue in the course I have hitherto pursued, speaking out, in all faithfulness and charity, such portions of the eternal Word of God as it is given me to see, whether that word be spoken through the Bible, through nature, or through human life; knowing that he who casts his seed corn upon the waters may lose the sight of it for a time, but shall assuredly find it, sooner or later. I have been misunderstood, and blamed very often; sometimes by enemies, who have delighted in their work; sometimes by friends, whose only crime has been that they did not see as I saw, and could not be expected to feel as I felt. But whatever faults may have belonged to my ministry during these four years, are, I am quite sure, far better known to myself than to any one else; and of such faults as I am conscious, no one can be more sorry that they have occurred than I myself am. And now, with such measure of success as has been vouchsafed to us, what can we do but lay at the feet of our Father our four years' work, asking that it may be accepted, not for its own worthiness' sake, half so much as for the sake of that mercy which endures for ever, and which is gentle and generous, even while it is obliged to condemn. In looking forward to the work of another year, I see that I shall only have to do in substance what I have hitherto done. I shall try to teach, and illustrate, and confirm, the doctrines of private judgment for ourselves, and for others; and of charity towards all, even those from whom we most extremely differ. The doctrine, too, of God's moral unity, and Fatherhood; of the identity of Christ and Christianity; of the greatness of man's nature and the deep fall of that nature through man's transgression; of salvation from sin and error through the once crucified, and now risen and reigning, Lord

Christ; of immortality as the free and pledged gift of God to his offspring; of religion, as consisting in being good and doing good; of duty, as being superior to, and the very source of all genuine happiness; of perfection, as the grand aim to which God has called his family; and of the manifestation of the divine wisdom and love through all things true, right, pure. These doctrines, or rather principles of truth and life, are what I must preach to you, if I preach at all. To me they are the glad tidings of God to an erring, sinful, and guilty world. Preach them I must, if I would be faithful to myself; preach them I must, if I would hope to benefit you; preach them I must if only that I may exhibit that spirit of charity for others which I seek at the hands of those from whom I differ. I close this fourth year of my ministry with devout gratitude for the past, and steadfast hope for the future. Let us, one and all, examine ourselves at such an hour as this, and with the feeling that all things lie open to the eye of God; and let us once more renew our vows of consecration, not alone to God, the author of every good and perfect gift, but also to the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom it is we have come to know God, not as the mere Creator, and the sustainer of our lives, but as the Father of every human being, and the good and impartial friend of us all."

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE OF THE NON-SUBSCRIBING ASSOCIATION.

On Wednesday, July 5, a meeting of the Committee of the Non-Subscribing Association was held in the Vestry of the Second Meeting-house, Belfast. It was convened chiefly for the purpose of receiving a deputation from the Remonstrant Synod, appointed to confer with it respecting the want of candidates for the ministry in the Non-Subscribing Churches. The Rev. John Montgomery, as one of the deputation, in a lucid and forcible statement, pointed out the necessity for taking whatever measures might be practicable to remedy the evil, and expressed an earnest hope that the Committee would give the matter their serious consideration. After much discussion the Committee passed the following resolutions:—

"That while we deplore the want of candidates for the Christian ministry in our churches, we believe that the very inadequate support afforded, in many cases, to ministers by their congregations, is a very serious discouragement to young men who might otherwise be led to adopt the clerical profession; and we recommend that steps be taken by this Committee to have the income of ministers increased where it may be necessary.

"That the ministers of the Association be earnestly requested to seek out, in their several localities, young persons of good character and fair ability, having a disposition to enter the Christian ministry, and in case such deserving young men should present themselves to this Committee, the Committee will afford them as liberal aid as the state of the educational fund will permit, during the course of their education.

"That an adjourned meeting of this Committee be held on Wednesday, the 2nd August, in the vestry of the Second Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast, at twelve o'clock, for the purpose of carrying out

the resolution of this Association respecting an increase of ministerial support."

On Wednesday, August 2nd, an adjourned meeting was held, at which the following resolutions were adopted :—

"That in order to carry out the resolution of July 5, respecting the increase of ministerial support, the Committee earnestly recommend the several bodies constituting the Association to take immediate steps for this purpose, and suggest that they invite such members of the bodies to co-operate with them, within their bounds, as they may deem likely to be able to aid them."

"That the Secretary communicate the foregoing resolution to the Clerks of the several bodies constituting the Association, requesting them to lay the same before their respective Synods or Presbyteries at an early day; and to report what has been done to a meeting of this Committee, to be held on the 11th day of October."

It was also resolved,—That the amount of school exhibitions to be paid out of the Education Fund be fixed at £10 per annum, including the expense of text-books, and that no exhibition be tenable for more than two years. That the amount of bursaries be fixed for the present at £15 per annum.

A resolution was also adopted condemnatory of the proposed change in the Queen's University.

INCLUSIVE OR EXCLUSIVE.

A series of letters from the Rev. J. Panton Ham has appeared in the pages of *The Inquirer*, to which replies have been made by the Editor of the paper, and by the Rev. James Martineau. As this discussion, from the character of the disputants and the importance of the question debated,—which is no other than the foundation principle of the Christian Church,—possesses much interest, we shall endeavour to lay an abstract of it before our readers as soon as it has reached its termination, which cannot be far distant.

OBITUARY.

Death of Valentine Whitla, Esq.—Mr. Whitla died on Saturday morning August 12, at his beautiful residence of Ben Eadan, under the Cave Hill, at the advanced age of seventy-seven years. The late Mr. Whitla's public services to the town of Belfast are too important to be soon forgotten. For very many years he devoted almost his whole attention to the improvements of the harbour, from which such important results have flowed. Probably no citizen ever gave to any local matter such an amount of earnest thought, laborious personal attention, and zealous interest as the late Mr. Whitla gave to the extension and improvement of the harbour of Belfast, and it is not too much to say that without him we should not have had the works which at present exist.

Those only who, like the present consulting engineer of the Harbour Commissioners, shared with the deceased gentleman the toil and the anxiety of carrying out the great improvements which are the highest proof of the ability and the foresight of those who designed and executed them, can adequately estimate the time, the trouble, and the money which he expended in that voluntary exertion to benefit Belfast. Our Botanic Gardens also owe their very existence in their present form to the late Mr. Whitla, whose admirable taste for floriculture, in combination with a generous desire for the advantage of others, led him to encourage and assist in the providing and maintaining for the public the same sources of gratification and recreation in which he delighted himself. Of his private virtues and large-hearted charity it is not easy to speak too highly. A noble proof of his philanthropy exists in the Stanhope Street Schools, which he erected and liberally supported. The deceased gentleman was a man of large mind, large heart, and open hand, and the universal respect and esteem in which he was held were not beyond his deserts.

[We copy the above from the *Northern Whig*, correcting the error in the age. To this just and by no means exaggerated estimate of his public character we have only to add, with respect to his connexion with our religious body, to which he was most firmly and sincerely attached, that the First Belfast Congregation in connexion with the Northern Presbytery of Antrim has lost a most valuable and judicious Elder, who manifested his warm attachment to his religious principles by a regular observance of religious ordinances, combined with a calmness of judgment, a conscientious adherence to principle, and a comprehensive liberality to those who differed from him, that tend more to dispel prejudice and commend to others that soberminded view of religious truth in which we delight, than any amount of disputatious subtlety or controversial sagacity. He was the survivor of a family of five brothers and a sister, who were all throughout their lives deliberately, soundly, and firmly attached to that religious society,—consistent and thoughtful adherents to our religious views,—averse from litigation, but steadfast in resistance to those licentious extremes that have done an almost irreparable injury to our religious denomination. We may further add, that the same unwearied attention that he gave to the affairs of the Harbour Board and the Royal Botanic Gardens, was also bestowed upon his liberal Educational Establishment, in the erection and arrangement of the premises, and the provision made for their permanence,—in all these cases, and in the last extensively, to his pecuniary loss. Nor should it be forgotten, that it was very much owing to the deep interest he took in our Domestic Mission that this useful and important establishment has been so successfully carried out.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

Errata.—The reader is requested to correct the following errata in the last number:—Page 233, line 6, insert "all" between "in" and "good." Page 239, line 18, for "approves" read "opposes;" and line 36, for "graduates" read "gravitates."

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] OCTOBER, 1865. [No. 9.

A STEP FARTHER.

IT is too well known that in the course of the last few years opinions have been propounded by members of the Unitarian denomination which, to ordinary thinkers, seem to be opposed not only to those views which have been commonly understood as Unitarian Christianity, but to the plainest declarations of the New Testament Scripture. Such has been the *ghost* theory of the resurrection of our Lord, which is espoused by the Rev. J. J. Tayler, and adopted by many of his young disciples; and also the utter denial of the resurrection of our Lord by the Rev. W. Binns and others: and, to pass over other novel doctrines which have lately been introduced into Christian pulpits, we may instance the resolute opposition made by many to any acknowledgment of Christian faith being required from candidates for the Christian ministry. That such opinions have gained a foot-hold in the Unitarian Church all who have been acquainted with its recent history well know. The adherents of this school have been called, whether boastingly by themselves, or sarcastically by their opponents, we cannot say, the "advanced" party: that they have "advanced" we admit, but not, we think, towards the goal of truth. Progress is not always upward: it is just as likely to be downward: at all events it is in this case farther from Christ and his Gospel, albeit they imagine themselves it is nearer to "absolute religion" and "absolute freedom."

In this movement we have now to record *a step farther*, for which we are indebted, not to one of those wild speculators who, philosophers rather than religionists by profession, sceptics rather than disciples, take pleasure

in assailing everything that is distinctively Christian; but to one of our weekly Unitarian papers, which boasts to have for its editorship the joint learning, piety, and faith of four ministers of religion. Lately we noticed with satisfaction the altered and improved tone which a leader in *The Herald* indicated, for it represented the positive work of the Unitarian Church to be "the maintenance of Christianity as a Divine revelation, given through Jesus Christ, and contained in the Bible." But, since that article appeared, the leaders from week to week have been expressing very discordant and sometimes contradictory views; and the leader of August 11th, is the most reckless and irreverent that has yet disfigured the columns of that journal.

The article is avowedly editorial, and therefore written by one who professes himself a minister of Christ; for each of the four editors has a ministerial charge. The subject is "Definite Thought, Speech, and Action," and the writer finds fault with those Unitarians who "talk about the Holy Scriptures," "call Christ their Saviour," and "offer up their prayers through Jesus Christ."

We can well understand why this editor of *The Herald* should spurn the idea of the Scriptures being "Holy," for he evidently disbelieves everything supernatural, denies everything miraculous, thinks that the works of Christ and his resurrection are nothing but fables, regards him simply as a Jew, somewhat more virtuous and talented perhaps than his neighbours, and considers the Scriptures as ordinary writings, which contain some truth and much fiction, some wisdom and much folly. Such is the view he takes of the Bible: but why, for consistency's sake, does he not remove the volume from his pulpit, or place by its side, and use alternately with it, Hume's Essays, Shakspere's Plays, and Tennyson's Poems, reading from them the *Scripture* Lessons, and selecting from them texts for his sermons? Is it that his people, favoured though they have been for years with such advanced ministrations, yet cling with feelings of reverence to a volume which he no longer considers as "holy?" Then we submit that he is guilty of the very error which he imputes to others; he fails in definite action, and panders to what he must believe to be the prejudice or

superstition of his flock. But are we correct in supposing that this writer is a member of "the Provincial Assembly," which, rejecting creeds, takes the Bible as its rule of faith? Then he professes, in such capacity of membership, an authority in the Scriptures which, in his capacity as editor, he utterly repudiates—an inconsistency which ill becomes one who lectures others on "Definite Speech and Action."

We trust that there are few indeed of those who patronize *The Herald*, who will join with its editor in dishonouring the Holy Scriptures. In Ulster those who have ranted most wildly against tests and creeds, and have even sought to base their church on "absolute religious liberty," have never dared thus to assail the sacred volume; and we hope that in England too—even in those manufacturing districts, where secularism has spread so widely—few who belong to the Unitarian Church will cease to regard, with devout sentiments, a volume which has been the richest source of light and strength, of comfort and blessed hope to the world.

This editor of *The Herald* further rebukes Unitarians for calling Christ their "Saviour." He alleges that many misunderstand the word, and attach wrong ideas to it. True; many think that they are saved by the physical sufferings which Christ endured on the cross, and fancy that the whole work of redemption centres in his death. Thus the Roman Catholics employ the pencil of the artist to depict the Holy One agonized on Calvary, and keep before them, as an aid to their faith in the Church and in the chamber, such affecting representations: and the Calvinist, who hates Roman Catholics and church pictures much alike, clings to the same idea of Christ's sufferings, and fancies that his blood literally washes out their sins. But the erroneous ideas which those Christians hold respecting salvation do not render false or worthless the grand truth that "the Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour* of the world." All who are conversant with the writings of Channing, Ware, and others—all indeed who have intelligently read the words of the Master himself—can understand how there is salvation through Christ, although they reject alike the dogmas of Rome and Geneva. If we are not to use the term "Saviour,"

because many misunderstand it, then we should not speak of God as our "Father," because the word, as we conceive, is misapprehended by the great majority of Christians; most of them thinking that it expresses only a fractional part of the Deity—the First person of the Trinity, to the exclusion of the Second and Third; and many believing that it denotes a Being who embraces in his parental love only a small minority of the human race, and with a partiality and cruelty most unlike a father, consigns the great majority, not because of their actual disobedience and wickedness, but of his own pleasure, to eternal torments in hell. It is absurd to argue, that because of prevailing misapprehension, we should abandon the most sacred and consolatory truths of Revelation, and cease to think of God as our Father and of Christ as our Saviour.

The question may naturally be asked—How can it be that any one who professes the Christian religion can hesitate to speak of Christ as a Saviour? The answer is obvious. Some who retain the Christian name—and this editor of *The Herald* is one of them—have abandoned all belief in the authority of revelation, and in the divine mission of our Lord, and have, therefore, most naturally ceased to attach any authority to his word or work: they place him on a level with other wise and virtuous men, whose influence has been for good; and this editor —and Christian minister—informs us that "*he has experienced exactly the same kind of spiritual benefit from the life and words of Theodore Parker as from those of Christ.*"

We shall not wonder at the farther objection which is made to praying "through Christ." Denying all spiritual authority to him, and regarding as nothing but superstition the belief in his mission from God, such "advanced" thinkers as this editor of *The Herald* will attach no importance to the instructions our Lord gave to his disciples; but those who receive the teachings of the New Testament Scripture will gratefully think of him who has taught them to pray, and in his name and spirit they will humbly and fervently seek the throne of grace.

It might have been supposed that sentiments so directly hostile to Christianity as those which we have been

noticing would have called forth an indignant remonstrance from many quarters, and especially from those ministers who are associated with the writer in the editorship of *The Herald;* but not so. They seem to have been generally received with indifference, if not with approval. One correspondent, indeed, in a tone of half-concealed irony, echoes the opinions which the editor had advanced, and sarcastically adds:—

"In pursuance of the tenor of your remarks on 'Definite Speech and Action,' I have a proposition to make, at once sufficiently definite and in harmony with the spirit of 'advanced' Unitarianism. If adopted, it will soon correct the indefinite policy of half-and-half Unitarians. My proposal is, that we should borrow from the Japanese, and adopt as one of our own rites, the annual ceremony of 'Trampling on the Cross,' which is, or was, practised at a place called Nagasaki, if I remember aright. With this addition 'advanced' Unitarianism will be complete and definite."

Some readers of *The Herald*, who seemingly bore with patience the anti-christian sentiments which were published with editorial authority, and who were not quick enough to detect the irony of the correspondent from whose letter the foregoing is an extract, immediately wrote protesting against the idea of "Trampling on the Cross;" and yet we conceive that the Cross is more seriously dishonoured, when ministers of a Christian Church in a Christian land repudiate the Saviour, and place his authority and influence on a level with those of some American politician and preacher, than when a crowd of ignorant Japanese trample on the emblem of a religion whose nominal adherents have insulted and plundered them. We must add, in justice to one of the four editor's of *The Herald*—the Rev. Dr. Beard—that several weeks after this most objectionable editorial appeared, and after it had been commented on by various correspondents, he published an article in which he expressed his dissent. But we are prompted to ask—Why so tardy in this step? Did he find that in various quarters it had given offence? We cannot tell; but it would have been more creditable to him to have entered his protest at once, and to have dissolved a partnership which can no longer be regarded as for the promotion of Christianity in any form. With as much consistency might he become joint-editor with Holyoake, the Secularist, of a

journal for the spread of religious knowledge. The two other editors are silent, and we may, therefore, presume, acquiesce in denying the sacredness of the Scriptures, repudiating the spiritual authority of Christ, and disowning him as the "Saviour."

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.

(*Continued from p.* 267).

All the knowledge which we now have of the Cairncastle Congregation or its minister, for the period intervening between 1761—the date of the lease of the meeting-house—and 1793,—the date of the ordination of Mr. Alexander as assistant and successor to Mr. Lewson,—is derived from certain rough notes* of five visitation Presbyteries which were held in Cairncastle at various times during this interval. Of the results of these several visitations the following is a brief abstract, and I am sorry to say that in one important particular it does not give a favourable view of the state of matters in the Congregation with which we are now concerned.

April 26, 1769.—Visitation Presbytery at Cairncastle, attended by Messrs. Robert Brown and John M'Kee, as Commissioners, who gave a satisfactory account of Mr. Lewson's behaviour and discharge of his duty as a Christian minister, as well as of the conduct of the elders. Mr. Lewson's account of the Congregation was also very satisfactory, except that there was no stated account of

* These notes, which are mostly in the handwriting of Rev. Adam Hill, of Ballynure, Clerk of Presbytery, are written, in many cases, on scraps of paper, and evidently are, what I have called them in the text, "rough notes," made by the Clerk at the time, with a view to future revision, and insertion in the minute-book. Such as they are, however, they are now all the records which we have of the business of the Presbytery of Templepatrick at the period to which they refer; and therefore I have had them bound up along with the book of regular minutes of the same Presbytery, which was kindly lent to me by my late friend and neighbour, Rev. W. J. Raphael, of Ballyeaston, recently deceased. I am happy to hear, from the executor of Mr. Raphael, that this book, with another of a similar character, is likely to find its way to the Library of the Presbyterian College, Belfast, which, indeed, is the proper home of all such documents.

stipend between him and his Congregation, and that there was a considerable sum of old arrears which was being increased every year. Mr. Rogers, of Ballynure, was appointed by the Presbytery to visit Cairncastle on this subject, and to propose "that those of the people who were wealthy should, by a voluntary subscription, add something to their yearly stipend." A Committee of Presbytery was also appointed to meet there on Communion Monday, to see the accounts stated between Mr. Lewson and his Congregation, and try to get the suggested addition made to the stipend by "the wealthy and well-disposed."

February 6, 1781.—Visitation Presbytery at Cairncastle, attended by Messrs. Archibald Tweed and Robert Taylor, as Commissioners from the Session, and Messrs. William Sheriff and Thomas Murphy, as Commissioners from the Congregation. The usual questions were asked of the Commissioners, and answered to the satisfaction of the Presbytery, until they came to the matter of stipend, when it again appeared that no stated account was forthcoming. This repeated omission was censured "as very unjustifiable" by the Presbytery, who also ordered the required account to be ready for their next meeting in May; and in the meantime, enjoined that collectors should be appointed to gather in the arrears as soon as possible, and that Messrs. Archibald Tweed, Thomas Murphy, John Neal, and Andrew Neal, should confer with Mr. Lewson on this matter. The foregoing resolution to be read to the Congregation of Cairncastle by Mr. Cowan, of Larne, who was directed to exchange pulpits with Mr. Lewson for that purpose. At the next meeting of Presbytery, in May, the accounts of Cairncastle stipend were still wanting; for though Mr. Lewson said he had prepared the account, yet it had never been published to the Congregation, nor had the persons appointed to confer with Mr. Lewson done so, nor had collectors been chosen.

February 3, 1784.—Visitation Presbytery at Cairncastle, when the usual questions were asked of the Commissioners (whose names are not given), and the usual satisfactory answers were received, until the stated account of stipend was called for, when it again appeared

that none had been prepared. Mr. Lewson was enjoined "to make out immediately a list of all stipend due at last December, distinguishing what is due by responsible persons, and what not, which minute is to be read publicly in Cairncastle pulpit by Mr. Read, of Glenarm, and the people called upon to pay Mr. Lewson before April next, when if any one has not paid, Mr. Lewson is urged to make out lists of all stipend then due in the several quarters of his Congregation, and apply personally to such as he can confide in, to call on every person whose name shall be on these lists, and if any remain unpaid at our next meeting, to return a full list of such to the Presbytery." At next meeting nothing appears about the subject.

November 3, 1789.—Visitation Presbytery at Cairncastle, attended by Messrs. Archibald Tweed and James Maxwell, as Commissioners from the Session, and Messrs. Lorimer and Callwell as Commissioners from the Congregation, who stated their perfect satisfaction with Mr. Lewson's conduct in every particular. Mr. Lewson also stated that "the people in general behaved well, and attended upon his public instructions;" but when the account of stipend between him and his Congregation was produced—for on this occasion it *was* produced—it rather belied the favourable account which the pastor had given of his flock, as it appeared therefrom that the latter were indebted to the former the considerable sum of £581 1s 7d. The Congregation of Cairncastle were enjoined to send Commissioners about this heavy arrear to next meeting of Presbytery, which, however, they do not seem to have done, nor to several ensuing meetings of Presbytery, although similarly enjoined to do so.

November 6, 1792.—Visitation Presbytery at Cairncastle, when it appeared that no Commissioners had been appointed to attend the Presbytery, which was not surprising, seeing that although all persons present from the Congregation declared "their perfect satisfaction with the conduct and character of Mr. Lewson as a man and minister of the Gospel;" yet an account, which was produced, shewed that the Congregation owed their minister no less a sum than £602 9s 1d. Even after this announcement, Mr. Lewson, strange to say, "declared his

general satisfaction with the conduct of the people;" and it appeared that, with a view to reduce this heavy arrear, he had made to his people a generous proposal, the particulars of which are not given, which they, however, had not had the equal generosity to accept. The Presbytery, after reasoning some time about the state of the Congregation, directed their Clerk "to write a letter to the people of Cairncastle expressive of the sentiments of the Presbytery." What effect this letter had we cannot tell, for there are no records to shew; but I fear, judging from what we have already seen of this matter, that it did not do much good.

In 1793, Mr. Lewson, who was then 87 years of age, and had been for 65 years minister of Cairncastle, obtained the services of an assistant and successor. He survived, however, until ten years afterwards; but as his connexion with the active duties of the pastorate of this parish ceased at the former period, I may here give all the information, in addition to what I have already stated, which I have been able to collect respecting this venerable and truly estimable man. He was spared to see the trying times of 1798; but being then 92 years of age, he did not, of course, take any active part in the proceedings of that eventful period. On the eve of the Insurrection the old man preached to his people, and amongst other observations, made one simple remark which is still remembered by the very few survivors of his Congregation who heard it, to the effect that in the coming struggle "he had not much to lose." In these words the pastor, I think, referred not to the scantiness of his worldly means, but to the few years which, under any circumstances, he could expect to live.

In addition to the discharge of his purely pastoral duties, Mr. Lewson in one matter acted a part which will not soon be forgotten in the parish which was the scene of his peaceful ministry, for its results must legally abide there "for ever." By his influence with the landed proprietors of the district, he procured, in a great many cases, for the occupying tenants of Cairncastle, leases in perpetuity of the lands which they occupied, at a rent, in nearly every instance, of a very few shillings per acre. I have been told that but for Mr. Lewson there would

have been very few leases of that kind in Cairncastle. And strange to say, the difficulty which he had in effecting these arrangements was not to get the landlords to give, but to induce the tenants to accept these leases in perpetuity; some of the tenants actually refusing to bind themselves to pay a rent of 2s. 6d. an acre for ever for land which is now set at 50s. or £3 an acre without a lease at all. I am sorry to add that even those who at this time did take out leases in perpetuity, on these highly favourable terms, did not thereby secure for their descendants "fixity of tenure"; for in the present day the cases are very few indeed in which the lands thus leased are now in the possession or occupation of the lineal descendants of the original lessees. Indeed, in some cases, their families and very names have disappeared from the parish altogether. But I need not say that for this lamentable result and almost total frustration of his benevolent intentions, Mr. Lewson is not to be held responsible. His object was to serve the tiller of the soil; and in the same spirit he even condescended on these occasions to act as an attorney, and to draw up the leases, every word of them, with his own hand. These leases were often severely tested, in law courts, by professional attornies who did not like the idea of a country minister intruding on their vocation; but in no single instance was a lease, or a will, which had been drawn up by Mr. Lewson, known to be broken.

Mr. Lewson does not seem to have ever lived in the house which had been the residence of his predecessors in the Cairncastle pastorate. During, I believe, the whole of his ministry of 75 years in this parish, he resided at Weyburn, where his successor and son-in-law, Mr. Alexander, afterwards built a handsome house, which is now occupied by my friend, Mr. John Tweed.

Mr. Lewson was twice married. His first wife was Alice Smith, of whose history I know nothing, except that she was a relative of Grizzle Smith, whose reputation as "the pretty Mrs. Shaw of Ballygally," is not yet entirely extinct in Cairncastle. By this lady he had one son, whose christian name I never heard, and who died young. Mr. Lewson's second wife was Margaret Nevin, daughter of Mr. Nevin, of Downpatrick, by whom he had one daughter, Margaret Nevin Lewson, born forty

years after the birth of his only other child, the son above mentioned. This daughter (who died in London, August 5, 1858, aged 84 years) married (1) Mr. Shaw, of Ballygally, by whom she had one son, William Henry Shaw, (the last male representative of this ancient family, who died in London in 1850,) and four daughters, of whom three survive; (2) Rev. Thomas Alexander, her father's assistant and successor, by whom she had five sons and one daughter. Of these, three sons (including my friend, Rev. Henry Alexander, the beloved minister of Newry) and the one daughter survive.

Mr. Lewson, I have been told by his grand-daughter, Miss Shaw, had a brother who lived in Dunmurry, where he himself was born, and who left sons and daughters; but none of these was ever married, and they are now all dead. I have also heard that some years ago there lived in Belfast a highly respectable watch and clock maker called Lewson, whose name may still be seen on the dial plates of old clocks in country houses, and who, I believe, was a relative of the fourth minister of Cairncastle.

As to Mr. Lewson's literary remains, I do not believe that he ever published anything except one sermon, entitled "The Gospel a Plain and Sufficient Rule," which he preached at the ordination of Rev. Robert Acheson at Glenarm, in 1792, when the preacher was 86 years of age. Of this sermon, which is highly creditable to the venerable author, I possess a copy. I have, also, two others of his sermons in manuscript. One of these was kindly given to me by his grand-daughter, and from marks in the preacher's handwriting, which are still legible on the back of it, it appears to have been delivered, amongst other places, in Larne, in the year 1798, when the preacher was 92 years of age.

Mr. Lewson died at Weyburn, in Cairncastle, in the year 1803, having attained the truly patriarchal age of 97. During the whole of his lengthened life, as I have been told by his grand-daughter, he never had one hour's illness. He was interred in the family burying-ground of the Shaws of Ballygally, which is a walled enclosure in the peaceful and picturesque church-yard of Cairncastle. To this posthumous distinction, the venerable minister

was well entitled, not only from his daughter's connexion by marriage with that ancient family, but still more from the friendly and effectual aid which he had afforded to Mr. Shaw, his patron and future son-in-law, at that disastrous juncture in the truly melancholy history of the Shaw family to which I alluded in a previous paper. In the case of Mr. Lewson, as in the case of his immediate predecessor, Mr. Taylor, no stone marks the spot where he takes his last long rest. But the omission, though I do most heartily wish that in both cases it were remedied, is not in either case to be regarded as indicative of disrespect. There is no family tombstone over the members of the Shaw family themselves; and I am sorry to say that the same is the case with respect to the Agnews of Kilwaughter, the Blairs of Blairmount, and the Johnstons of Glynn; in fact, I believe, with respect to all the families of the old gentry of this neighbourhood. But although Mr. Lewson's last resting place is not marked by sepulchral monument of any kind, yet I am sure that the memory of his patriarchal virtues, and of his lengthened and useful life, will long be cherished in the romantic parish which for 75 years was the scene of his pastoral labours. In that parish—if I could imagine his sainted spirit now to revisit Cairncastle—he would, I fear, find everything sadly changed, except, indeed, the grand and majestic features of external nature, such as the bold headland of Ballygally—the lovely, sequestered nooks of the North end, and the magnificent amphitheatre of the Sallagh Braes, which alone of all things in Cairncastle have, since the time of Mr. Lewson's ministry there, escaped disruption and decay.

(*To be continued.*)

BEARING THE CROSS.

The heavier cross, the nearer heaven:
No cross without, no God within;
Death, judgment, from the heart are driven,
Amidst the world's false glare and din.
O happy he, with all his loss,
Whom God hath set beneath the cross!

The heavier cross, the better Christian;
This is the touchstone God applies.
How many a garden would lie wasting,
Unwet by showers from weeping eyes!
The gold by fire is purified;
The Christian is by trouble tried.

The heavier cross, the stronger faith;
The loaded palm strikes deeper root;
The vine juice sweetly issueth
When men have pressed the clustered fruit;
And courage grows where dangers come,
Like pearls beneath the salt sea foam.

The heavier cross, the heartier prayer;
The bruised herbs most fragrant are;
If wind and sky were always fair,
The sailor would not watch the star;
And David's Psalms had ne'er been sung,
If grief his heart had never wrung.

The heavier cross, the more aspiring;
From vales we climb to mountain crest;
The pilgrim, of the desert tiring,
Longs for the Canaan of his rest;
The dove has here no rest in sight,
And to the ark she wings her flight.

The heavier cross, the easier dying;
Death is a friendlier face to see;
To life's decay we bid defying;
From life's distress we then are free.
The cross sublimely lifts our faith
To Him who triumphed over death.

Thou crucified! the cross I carry—
The longer, may it dearer be;
And, lest I faint whilst here I tarry,
Implant thou such a heart in me,
That faith, hope, love, may flourish there,
Till, for my cross, the crown I wear.

THE GOSPEL IN THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

The sacred narrative presents the Saviour to us in three aspects—living, teaching, and dying. In each of these we may perceive distinctly the leading features of the Gospel. All who receive Jesus as the Christ regard him in his life, doctrine, and death as the richest source of religious light and truth—the rock which, touched by God's own hand, sends forth spiritual streams for the refreshing and purifying of the world; and the more we turn our thoughts to him, not in a spirit of criticism, but of reverence—not for controversy, but for guidance—the more may we hope to have his spirit illuminating our soul, and his image stamped upon our life. Let us contemplate the Gospel in the life of Christ. And here I ask the reader to think of Jesus, not as an imaginary but a real being, whose life was subject to all the conditions under which we live, who hungered and thirsted, ate and drank, laughed and wept, rejoiced and sorrowed, as we do; and I ask him to picture him to his mind as living in a land similar to our own, different to be sure in its latitude, and therefore in its climate and productions, but having hills and plains like our own, changing seasons, arched heavens, beast, bird, and flower—in short, dwelling upon this earth, and subject to all the circumstances and conditions which an earthly life implies. See him, in imagination, living in Palestine, and contemplate the leading features which characterize him. Others, politically and humanly speaking, were greater, and wielded a mightier influence in the land. Whence then the greatness of his character? I might reply in the words of Peter to Cornelius and his household—"God was with him." I might refer to the "signs and wonders" which, by God's power, he wrought; and, in estimating the authority of Christ, it is needful to take these into account. If we exclude them, we destroy the special and divine character of the Christian religion. But if we could for a moment suppose such miraculous attestations accompanying a selfish and profane life, we would be thrown into perplexity, just as the navigator would if he found that the stars in the heavens deceived him, or the

philosopher, if he found his scientific deductions to be in opposition to fact. It is not Christ's miraculous power that renders his life the subject of admiration and reverence, and makes it worthy of our devoted imitation. That life, in its striking and beautiful characteristics, recommends itself, not indeed to every man, however depraved or irreverent his life, but to the calm reflection and awakened conscience of all. What are these characteristics? I admire the genius and skill of the artist who has contrived to present on the canvas the Saviour almost living, and by a wonderful power of conception to embody in his countenance and mien the very impersonation of his character; and I admire the wonderful power of our own Channing, who seems to understand the greatness of our Lord, and exhibits, in eloquent language, the divine lineaments it presents. We cannot hope thus to form a correct estimate of our Master; but it was not those only who, in the days of his mortal life, were fitted to apprehend the height of his devotion and the depth of his love, that regarded him with reverence. Many there were, less able to appreciate his worth, who yet admired and loved him; so let us hope that we may devoutly regard him, albeit we do so at a distance, and imperfectly.

The most prominent feature in the character of our Lord is his consciousness of God's presence, as that of a loving father. With him it was no occasional thought rising up in his mind, and then, under the influence of worldly objects, sinking and disappearing, but an abiding sentiment, a kind of ever-acting sense, by which he continually perceived him. He saw nothing, did nothing without him. He felt his presence as truly and distinctly as the child his father when he walks by his side, his hand clasped in his; as truly and distinctly as the infant its mother when she carries it in her arms and presses it to her bosom. He felt the wisdom and goodness of his Father, knew that all his plans and purposes were beneficent, and knew that his own highest good was to do his Father's will. That living presence of his Father with him and around him was the source of his spiritual strength and greatness. Amid all conflicting interests it was a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night to direct him. Wherever He led, our Master was prepared to

follow; whenever He spoke our Master was ready to obey. Hence the reality and the earnestness of his devotion. Entering into the communion he held with his Father, we may understand how everything to his mind spoke of him—hill and lake, star, bird, flower; and we may understand also how he lingered through whole nights in the silence and loneliness of the mountain, in prayer to God. How far this deep and clear sense of God's presence may be traced to our Lord's nature, or how far to the inflowing spirit of God, supernaturally bestowed on him, theology, I conceive, seeks in vain to determine; but its reality our Saviour's life abundantly exhibits. Nearer to him in the thronging crowd than aught else, nearer in the peaceful chamber than his nearest disciple, nearer in the secluded garden than the chosen ones who sought to watch with him, was his Father—that presence was his richest solace and his greatest strength.

Next to his sense of God's presence, and his faith in Him as the Father, we place his love to men. Deep down in his soul were laid these two pillars of goodness. He lived among the Jews, and observed their religious rites, but he rose above their prejudices, and felt an interest in the Gentile and the Samaritan. He looked on all men as God's children, and he felt for all as brethren; hence to none did he act unjustly, to none unkindly. Christians in successive generations, who have maltreated and persecuted their fellow-men, can find nothing in his life to give them a plea or excuse for their injustice. Within his expanding love all were embraced, no matter what their nation or their creed. Nor was the charity of our Lord that sickly sentimentalism which regards with indifference or complacency the follies and the sins of men. In his conduct towards the Pharisees we see how he regards hypocrisy and exposes it. His love for the erring or the sinful never made him indifferent to truth or goodness.

Whence this deep and abiding love, which no indifference on the part of others could check—no ingratitude could weaken—no cruelty destroy? Did he draw it from that heavenly region, where love, pure and intense, ever abides, or was it kindled in his soul by the inspira-

tion of Him who is essentially love? We cannot tell; but there, in his life, it beams forth, the wonder and admiration of all who devoutly contemplate it.

Our Lord had compassion for the sinful. It is said by one of the evangelists that "he knew what was in man." Then he knew his weakness and his temptations, tendencies perhaps to evil that seemed to drag him headlong, and surrounding influences that polluted the moral atmosphere, and rendered it almost impossible to escape from the pollution of sin. He regarded not merely the injury that sin inflicts on others—pain, trouble, and loss; but perhaps still more the injury which it brings to the sinner himself. Some sins cause fearful calamities to others, and some almost none; but every sin brings evil on him who commits it. *There* there is no escape; its poison distils into his soul. Christ saw what misery the sinner brought directly and permanently on himself, what happiness he sacrificed, what peace he ruined, what usefulness he destroyed, what glory he cast from him; and, therefore, he had pity for him. Hence the words of entreaty, the looks of gentleness, and the deeds of kindness he bestows on the sinner. We are at first disposed to agree with his calumniators, and fancy that one who could notice the sinner in tones of kindness must be indifferent to sin; but calm reflection shows us that what his enemies represented as a fault is truly a virtue; what they cast up to him as a reproach is indeed his glory. And so we find him labouring for the benefit of sinners, seeking them out, pleading with them, inviting them, helping them, that they may turn from evil.

We find him manifesting sympathy with the afflicted. Busied with momentous interests, and engaged in an important work, he did not disregard the trials and sorrows that chequered the life of many. The scanty records we possess show him in the chamber of sickness, and in the scene of death; and, doubtless, had we a complete history of his life, we would have many instances of his sympathy detailed. His was not that nobleness of soul which the Romans used to admire, and which the stoics sought to produce—not a heart petrified, its generous emotions checked and destroyed, but a heart warm and full, every gentle feeling quickened, and every holy

sympathy tremblingly alive to the sorrows and trials of others.

It would be an imperfect sketch of our Lord's character which did not represent him as firm in resisting temptation, and resolute in pursuing the path of duty. And here is the grandeur of his life: he was gentle as a child, pitying as an angel, but firm and unyielding as a hero. We see, as in a picture, various strong temptations assailing him, but they fall powerless from his soul, as the angry billows from the tall rock against which they chafe and foam. How wonderful that on that pure soul no cloud of sin rested—into its depths no evil entered! Here is the great miracle of the Saviour's life, more impressive than the stilling of the tempest or the healing of the sick. And how boldly he follows the appointed path; there is no hesitation, no attempt at compromise; but his course is "onward—right on." He sees clearly what is right—what is his Father's will,—and he unflinchingly pursues it.

Omitting other characteristics of our Lord, let me only mention his clear perception of the future life; it was to him no conjecture or vague theory, but a reality, and hence a power to nerve him for duty, and fill him with glorious expectations. To this we trace his entire triumph over danger and death.

This character of Christ is the reflection of his Father —the image of the invisible one. In the stillness of the air, when autumn has ripened the grain and seared the leaves, we look on the placid surface of the water, and, lo! the arched heavens are there, every fleecy cloud and blue expanse distinctly mirrored; and so we contemplate the life of Christ, and see reflected in it the character of God, that character not marred and blotted by clashing and conflicting sentiments of kindness and partiality, mercy and wrath, but plainly exhibiting all-comprehensive love, abiding and unextinguishable compassion for the sinning, sympathy with the afflicted, and holiness, pure and unsullied. Christ—"the image of the invisible God."

Here, then, we have the Gospel in the life and character of our Master, and we see its requirements. We are taught to love God as our Father, to trust in Him,

and to seek above all else to carry out his divine will. A love so deep as that which dwelt in our Lord we may seek in vain to possess; but to have something of that love animating our souls, giving earnestness to our devotion, and purpose to our life, should be our constant effort. We are taught to love our fellow-men, and, passing beyond the limits of sect, or nation, or colour, to look on all as our brethren, and to suffer no conflicting interest and no injury to crush out charity from our soul. It tends to draw us to the sinner, not that we may join him in his sin, but that possibly we may emancipate him from it, breathe into his mind a new life, and lead him into the pleasant paths of virtue. It tends to awaken sympathy with the sinning, and prompts us to mitigate their sorrows, and alleviate their afflictions. It arms us against temptation, and helps us, at all hazards and every sacrifice, to seek the way of holiness.

But scepticism whispers that this life of Christ may not, after all, be the Gospel of God, but only a human character, formed by care and industry, and its features may not be the embodiment of God's will. Not so, for "God was with him," and gave him, in the miraculous power he possessed, the signature of his approval; therefore we may confidently regard the life of Christ as exhibiting divine truth and love—the Gospel of the grace of God. S. S. R.

INCLUSIVE OR EXCLUSIVE?

Under this title the editor of *The Inquirer*, who advertises his paper as "The Weekly Organ of the Unitarian Body," published, on the 8th of July, 1865, a leading article, composed in his usual style of theological see-saw, yet manifestly intended to run down the great principle that a Christian Church should be built on the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ of God, and should adhere to that faith as its united profession and recognized bond of union. With reference to that principle he asks—

"Are we henceforth to be a little sect, jealously guarding its narrow pale, rigidly defining its articles of faith, excluding from Christian fellowship all who do not come up to a certain standard

of Unitarian Orthodoxy, (save the mark!) and so gradually separating ourselves from all the higher thought and freer tendencies of our age; or are we to be the true Broad Church, planting itself on eternal principles of freedom, progress, and aspiration, which are independent of all the changes of theological speculation, adopting whatever is true and noble in all forms of thought, proscribing no man as heretic or unsound, claiming fellowship with all true and honest inquiry; *while taking its stand upon a Christian basis*, recognising as Christian every man who professes himself a disciple of Christ, and requiring as practical proof of that discipleship simple conformity to the spirit of the life of Christ, rather than any profession of faith upon doubtful questions of miracles and inspiration, or any precise definition even of the terms Christ and Christianity?"

Here it is evident enough that the words which we have taken the liberty of printing in italics are simply thrown in to counterbalance the very plain and intelligible meaning of the rest of the writer's long question. But after all, they are no equal counterpoise; for whatever may be meant by "*the Christian basis*" of which they speak, it cannot signify *faith in Christ in any sense*, for that would be an "article of faith," a "standard of Unitarian Orthodoxy," a "dogmatic profession," all of which the writer strenuously repudiates. We do not stop to inquire whether belief in Christ is justly described as a separation "from all the higher thought and freer tendencies of our age," or whether the application of the test of discipleship which the editor proposes, viz., "simple conformity to the spirit of the life of Christ," would not require a tribunal invested with powers far more searching and inquisitorial than any that could be erected by Mr. Bache's proposal at the last meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which the writer denounces and condemns.

In the next *Inquirer* (July 15) appeared a letter from the Rev. J. Panton Ham, minister of the Congregation of Essex Street, London, in which he combated the editor's positions. Notwithstanding "the ugly word *exclusive*" which the editor had applied to those who dissented from his own views, Mr. Ham professed his willingness to join in the discussion. He says—

"The definition you have given of the word *inclusive*, and which you consider ought to be the principle of Unitarian Christianity, is so broad in its area as to comprehend not only all shades,

but all substances of opinion on matters of religion. It not only embraces the advocates of free inquiry, but such as have reached positive and dogmatic conclusions against the credibility of the Christian histories, and the supreme authority of Jesus as the Christ of God and the Sovereign Head of the Church. You utterly abhor a *creed* as the basis of religious association; but your abhorrence seems to me to be rather of a creed in favour of Christianity, *while you have no objection to the most dogmatic creed against it.* You insist on one sole principle, that of absolute personal freedom; and you claim that whithersoever the exercise of this freedom may carry religious inquirers, however widely they may diverge from one another, the Unitarian Church shall meet them at all points, and offer them a spiritual resting-place and home. The Unitarian Church, in your conception of it, is indeed a very 'Broad Church,' a *Free* Church in the most unlimited sense of the word."

In the justice of this representation of the whole aim and tendency of *The Inquirer's* article, (with the exception of the line which we have italicised, and for which we see no sufficient authority,) we must fully concur; nor do we perceive how any unprejudiced reader can dissent from it. Mr. Ham proceeds to shew that church-union on such a basis would be totally impracticable. Christians, Deists, and Atheists could not permanently associate together for religious worship, nor for the promotion of other objects of a distinctively religious nature. He then adverts to the qualification introduced by the words of the editorial article which declare that the church must "take its stand upon a *Christian* basis;" and proves that if these words are to be understood in their ordinary and legitimate sense, they constitute "*a creed;*" they imply "*finality;*" they "set a *limit* to free inquiry." He asks—

"Are you then prepared to say that if freedom of inquiry carries a man *beyond Christ and Christianity,* he is placed *de facto* and voluntarily, outside the pale of the Christian Church? You certainly imply as much in this part of your leader. I am at one with you here, and I presume Mr. Bache is so likewise. Is this to be '*exclusive?*' Does not such a man exclude himself? What has he to complain of? Who has denied or denounced his freedom? He has no desire to identify himself with the Christian Ecclesia; and Christians do not invite him to do so, because they know that conscience and practical convenience, on both sides, could not be maintained by such an Association. Are these the men you refer to, and condemn as *exclusionists?* . . . Such remarks are neither apposite nor just. There may have been such among us; but they are not of this category who say of those who have shifted themselves from the '*Christian basis,*' in the words of an apostle,

'They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.'"

In his reply, the editor repudiated, as he had a right to do, the assertion that "he had no objection to the most dogmatic creed against Christianity"; but he acknowledged the relevancy of the other statements which we have cited from Mr. Ham.

"Mr. Ham tells us that our views are too broad for any *existing* Church organization.* If this be so, we can only say, in no conscious spirit of vanity or arrogance, so much the worse for the existing Church organizations. We have only another evidence that our modern Churches and sects have not yet realized the full breadth and universality of *the glorious Gospel* (!!!). It is a matter of very little importance to us whether our views accord, or otherwise, with existing organizations; we only care to ask whether they promote truth and freedom."

As to the alleged inconsistency of the proposal to found the church on the principle of unrestricted free inquiry, and at the same time of erecting it on a distinctly Christian basis, *The Inquirer* says—

"Our friend adds that our views are inconsistent, because while at one time we recognize Christ as the foundation of the Church, elsewhere in the same article we advocate the most unrestricted freedom of inquiry. Be it so. We prefer that our Christianity should be illogical and inconsistent rather than it should be narrow and exclusive. But the inconsistency is not so apparent in the above statement. We have perhaps as strong convictions on the subject of Christ and Christianity as any of our correspondents,—convictions, we may add, leaning to the conservative rather than to the advanced school of theology; but we must repeat over and over again that, with the views of religious liberty in which we have been trained, we cannot make our convictions a test for others, or arrogantly assume that we know more of Christ than many a conscientious inquirer, who, though they (*sic*) may doubt many things that appear to us vital truths, may have a far truer conception and closer grasp of the fundamental spiritual verities of our faith than those who denounce them as 'infidels' and 'sceptics.'"

Here it is obvious that the editor turns off to a point which was not in question, namely, *his own personal opinions as a theologian*, and leaves untouched the real

* This, we may remark, *is not what Mr. Ham had said.* He had said that the editor's views were such that *no Church organization whatever* could meet them, and had called on him to shew how, consistently with his views, *any* ecclesiastical existence would be *practically possible.*

point at issue, namely, whether the Church, as he wishes it to be constituted, should or should not proclaim its willingness to acknowledge, as its ministers and members, persons who have avowedly, in the exercise of their undoubted right of free inquiry, thrown off all adherence to Christ as an authorized and authoritative teacher. In another part of his article he is more explicit. He says, and in such a manner and connexion as shew that he approves of the policy which he describes—

"The general sentiment and policy of *our Church* are characterized by holding fast to the principle of freedom, even in preference to the results attained through our freedom."

Of course Mr. Ham does not fail to grapple with this proposition, on which he thus comments in his next communication—(*Inquirer*, 22nd July, 1865)—

"This is candid, direct, and emphatic. I will be equally explicit, and say that, although some kind of association may be possible on such a basis, the *Christian* association, or *Church*, is not possible. . . . Mere freedom, irrespective of 'results,' narrows the association to the bare principle of religious liberty; and religious liberty may land a man in a great variety of dogmatic beliefs; Judaism, Mohammedanism, pure Theism, and negative Atheism. The Unitarian Church, which, according to you, is indifferent to 'results,' is the proper resting place for these divergent and conflicting beliefs. 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' Can people of all creeds have a visible and practical fellowship such as is implied in our idea of a Church? . . . If the Unitarian Church is this all-embracing fold, is it a *Christian* Church? The Jew who is still looking for the Christ, the Mohammedan who believes that Mahomet was the Christ, the Theist who looks for no Christ, and believes that none has come, and the Atheist who believes in neither God nor Christ, are all believers in religious freedom; but are these the elements of a Christian Church? Must they not all separate, and for their respective convenience associate themselves according to their radical beliefs? Does one exclude the other, or does not each exclude himself, as his own voluntary act, in the exercise of his personal freedom?"

The editorial comment on this communication denies the correctness of Mr. Ham's representation of his opponent, as having "contended for the simple principle of religious freedom as the sole basis of Christian association, or as having held that the Unitarian Church is indifferent to results." This is mere quibbling. He certainly commended the Unitarian Church on the ground

of its "*holding fast to the principle of freedom, even in preference to the results attained through our freedom*," for these are his own words; these words Mr. Ham quoted *verbatim;* and in commenting on them he fairly, fully, and impartially stated what is their self-evident aim and drift, as he had a right to do. Certainly the editor has a right, if he pleases, to retract them, if he thinks they go too far; and it seems to us that he wishes to do so, though he does not take the straightforward way of doing it. He says, however—

"With many of the conclusions to which Mr. Ham has given eloquent expression, we have already signified our entire agreement. Ours, we have often contended, is a Christian Church, founded upon a *definitely Christian basis;* and the various societies and organisations by which we endeavour to promote our opinions are established with the view of bringing into co-operation those who desire to labour together for avowedly Christian purposes. This *definite Christian basis* does not seem to us inconsistent with the largest liberty, while men are left to the natural process of elective affinities to co-operate on this broad principle, or to choose another spiritual home and other ecclesiastical agencies, according as they agree or disagree with the general tone and public sentiment of our branch of the Church universal."

The writer goes on to contend that the proposal of Mr. Bache that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association should empower its committee to take measures for removing an ambiguity which confessedly has sprung up of late years, in the use of the terms *Christ, Christian, and Christianity*, and for "so expressing the principles and objects of the Association that no reasonable doubt may remain with respect to them," is inconsistent with the principles laid down in the paragraph just quoted. To us it would seem that a "*definite* Christian basis" is a Christian basis that is *distinctly defined*, so as to be no longer ambiguous; and that if men are invited to attach themselves, according to their "elective affinities," to any organisation for the promotion of religious principles and objects, it is only fair and reasonable so to state those principles and objects that they may know whether the latter are such that they feel for them any "spiritual affinity," and whether the organisation is one which they can conscientiously "elect" to enter. Beyond this Mr. Bache does not propose to go, nor would we, if we were in his position.

In the next number of *The Inquirer*, Mr. Ham recalls attention to the object and origin of the discussion, and states, or reiterates, the point which he had undertaken to defend. Assuredly he does not err on the side of exclusiveness; *many will think he goes too far in the way of latitudinarianism;* but he is a man who thinks for himself, and whose independence of spirit, even those who differ from him most widely, will acknowledge and respect. He says—

"The point at issue between us is this,—whether the principle of religious liberty, or any dogma, is the basis of the Christian Church, and the term of Christian fellowship and communion. You have affirmed the former, I the latter. I have quoted the apostolic dictum—'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' I pause here. I recognize every man as a Christian who accepts this dictum. He may doubt whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah predicted by Moses and the prophets; he may be unable to receive the apostolic testimony to the supernatural character of his historical manifestations. His liberty permits this. The necessities of his knowledge and understanding may justify this. I do not deny his Christianity, though I entirely disagree with him. We both agree to differ. . . . The matter, however, assumes another and a more definite aspect when a man pushes his objections to the supernatural so far as to deny that Jesus was the Christ, as the specially anointed delegate of God to teach with authority, and exemplifying in his own life of immaculate perfection the principles of the true normal religion for humanity. Such a man digs up for himself, with disdain, the apostolic foundation altogether. Jesus is thus reduced to the ordinary level of the common human life; he does not speak with authority; his revelations of the invisible world may be the mere dreams of an over-enthusiastic mind; he adds nothing for certainty to the stock of our religious knowledge, and the future life is as much shrouded in the vail of impenetrable darkness as it was before he became a fact of history. He is neither the life nor the light of men. I differ *toto cœlo* from such a man. I can neither commune nor co-operate with such a man in specially *Christian* fellowship and work, nor can he with me. He calls himself a Theist; I call myself a Christian; and we neither affront nor exclude each other by giving to each his proper name, and by each going his own separate way. . . . We both respect liberty of conscience, and the most perfect freedom of religious expression and action; but we cannot make an unrestricted liberty of this quality, regardless of results, the basis of *Christian* fellowship and association."

The editor of *The Inquirer* apparently conceived that the discussion had proceeded far enough, and accordingly announced that it was closed. He said it had "not been

without its use in clearing up mutual misunderstanding," and bringing himself and Mr. Ham "into closer agreement." He says—

"The case between us and our friend appears to stand as follows:—

"1st. Mr. Ham contends that faith in Christ and not the principle of unrestricted liberty must be the corner stone of the Christian Church. *So say we. . . . Upon this point there is no controversy whatever.*"

Having thus distinctly accepted the point for which his adversary contended, and having in the most emphatic terms renounced that for which he had himself been supposed to be fighting, we might imagine that nothing more remained for him to do but to propose to Mr. Ham that they should "shake hands and swear brothers!" But this would not be in accordance with the laws of theological equilibrium, *the principle of the see-saw* on which *The Inquirer* systematically regulates its movements; and therefore the editor proceeds to neutralize, and in fact either *to contradict* what he had just said so emphatically, or *to take all meaning out of it*, by adding—

"2nd. We proposed in our first article the question how far association for a doctrinal purpose is consistent with perfect individual freedom and theological progress." [A singular question, we must say, to be proposed by a member and officer of the British and Foreign *Unitarian* Association, *an association avowedly formed for doctrinal purposes*, and by the editor of a newspaper which advertises itself as the *organ of a denomination!*] "We have contended, and now repeat, that Christianity, in our interpretation of it, recognizes no principle of exclusion, and admits into the *all-embracing* Christian communion men of *infinite variety of beliefs*, who are nevertheless united by the moral attraction of the life and spirit of Christ."

So, it seems, "faith in Christ," though it be "the corner stone of the Christian Church," is not at all required to make a man a Christian! To contend that it is, is to maintain "a principle of exclusion!" And Christianity "recognizes no principle of exclusion;" it admits men of "infinite variety of beliefs," and in fact is "*all-embracing!*" If these things be not mutually destructive, we know not where to look for statements that are.

As was to be expected, a number of communications from other pens were forwarded to *The Inquirer;* some

friendly to the views of the editor, others to those of Mr. Ham. We have not space to refer to any of these, except some which bore the respectable signature of the Rev. James Martineau. In the paper of the 12th of August he asked Mr. Ham to verify his statement that there are persons who maintain that "Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church, and form [*term?*] of Christian fellowship, explaining where and by whom that opinion has been maintained, and quoting the words which express it." Mr. Ham did not feel himself called on to satisfy this demand made by a new opponent, with whom he had no controversy, but appealed to Mr. Martineau himself whether it has not been the habit of too many writers of late years to denounce creed *in extenso*, and to argue that religious freedom, "irrespective of results," is the only possible bond of Christian association? Mr. Martineau replies that "he has often seen this obnoxious opinion *imputed*; he has never seen it *maintained*." And as to his own view of the matter, he reiterates a declaration which he made on a similar occasion six years ago—"*No one more heartily despises than I do* the proposal to raise a Church on the mere basis of Free Inquiry."—(*Church Life or Sect Life?* p. 30.) We shall take an early opportunity of recalling to Mr. Martineau's recollection some striking examples of that very assertion which he says "he has often seen *imputed*, never *maintained*." In the meantime, we recommend to the attention of some who have put forward this "obnoxious opinion," and who have been in the habit of pleading the authority of Mr. Martineau's name in support of their views,—his strong and emphatic declaration that "*no one despises their principle of Church-union more heartily than he does!*"

The result of the whole correspondence is to deepen our conviction that Unitarianism in England, as in our own neighbourhood, *is rent to its very foundations*; that under that common name are included *at least two strongly marked and absolutely irreconcilable schools of thought*; that though many of the friends of both schools are anxiously endeavouring to keep up the *appearance* of harmonious action, the effort is a painful one, for they are quite conscious of their mutual divergencies; that it

is a useless effort as regards the public at large, which is perfectly aware of their differences; that it involves both sides in compromises and inconsistencies, which, to say the least, render it extremely difficult for them to satisfy the requirements of their own conscience and judgment; and that it would be wise in those who are at issue on points of fundamental importance to desist from the effort to maintain an outward show of co-operation, in which there is no cordiality nor real harmony at bottom.

We have endeavoured to give those passages in which Mr. Ham and the editor of *The Inquirer* define their respective positions, rather than the arguments by which they support them. The general nature of the latter will easily be imagined by those who have followed the course of the recent discussions among the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland.

J. Scott Porter.

THE RELATION OF MIRACLES TO CHRISTIANITY.*

This is the appropriate title of a Lecture by the Rev. Thomas Madge, senior minister of the Essex Street Chapel, London, delivered first to his own Congregation, and afterwards in Hackney Unitarian Church. The subject of the lecture is one which is occupying much attention at present in the Unitarian denomination, and it is encouraging to find a minister so highly distinguished among his brethren for character, ability, and attainments, speaking out boldly and distinctly on this important question. That some who occupy Christian pulpits utterly reject the miracles is now a well-known fact; and we commend the candour of those who plainly declare their disbelief, although we are not able to understand how they reject the supernatural, and continue to profess any kind of faith in the Gospel of Christ. Till recently Revelation was considered to imply miraculous interposition on the part of God; and all who argued for the truth of Christianity, whether they were in their theological views Trinitarian or Unitarian, contended for

* A Lecture, by Thomas Madge. London: Whitfield, Green, & Son, 178, Strand. 1865.

the reality of the Christian miracles as indissolubly bound up with revealed religion. It remained for thinkers of our own day to discover that they might profess faith in the New Testament, while they regard much of it as legendary and fabulous; and undertake to proclaim the Gospel of Christ, while that which is its leading and distinctive feature they reject as superstition. Whether the extraordinary position which these reasoners have assumed may be traced to an eccentricity of intellect or to an infirmity of morals, we cannot determine; but what may seem to them ingenious, we should rather be disposed to regard as most disingenuous. Still, we are thankful that they openly proclaim their unbelief. Whether there may be others sympathizing with them in the rejection of all that is miraculous, and silently disseminating their anti-supernatural views, while all the time they hide their opinions under vague terms and phrases, which, like the responses of the ancient oracle, may mean one thing or another, we have no authority to state; but we know there is a large class of persons in our denomination, including not a few ministers, who profess belief in the supernatural character of Revelation and in the reality of miracles, but, at the same time, consider the question as an unimportant one, and, strangely enough, do not understand why there should be any controversy on the matter. In the present position of our Church, we regard this party as most injurious; for, while they may seem to be on the side of those who claim for our Saviour a special and divine mission, they throw all the weight of their influence into the opposite side, indulge in high-flown expressions about liberty of thought and the right of private judgment, which captivate the unthinking, and seize every opportunity that offers to edge in a word in behalf of the advocates of "a free theology."

We do not understand how any one can make this subject of the supernatural "an open question," which the teachers of Christianity may believe or deny; for, according to the view which we take of it, we must regard the religion of Christ as possessing divine authority, or as being simply the religion of nature and the unaided reason of man. There is a prevailing idea that

the miracles of Christ were chiefly designed to illustrate and enforce his doctrines; but the grand purpose for which they were wrought was to prove his mission, and therefore to give authority to every doctrine he taught and every promise he uttered. Again, some may fancy that they may deny the miracles, and yet hold by the supernatural in Christ's character and doctrine; but the arguments which seem to them strong enough to justify them in rejecting the miraculous, must also be equally strong to disprove everything supernatural. The truth is that, properly speaking, "miraculous" and "supernatural" are synonymous terms, and the rejection of the one is the denial of the other. Either the Revelation that is by Jesus Christ is specially from God, or it is not. If from God, we may rest on it as authoritative; if not from God, it is merely the reasonings and conjectures of erring and fallible men. Between these two conflicting views there is a great gulf fixed, and no human ingenuity can remove it, or bridge it over.

In Mr. Madge's lecture we have a succinct and most satisfactory outline of the evidence on which a belief in the Christian miracles rests, and of their intimate and necessary connexion with the religion to which they relate. After remarking that the Four Gospels, from their great antiquity, and from the testimony borne to their genuineness and faithfulness by very early Christian authorities, may be regarded as most trustworthy, he proceeds to show that, wherever Christian Churches were established, "the Gospels were received as oracles, as the foundation and pillar of the faith, and assigned to the writers whose names they bear." He then goes on to argue against the prevailing tendency to discredit all miracles.

"But these accounts, we are told, relating to facts of which we have had no experience, are of a nature to deprive them of all claims to credit. Miracles, it is alleged, are either impossible or incredible. This is the sort of language which is now very much in fashion. A strong disinclination to accept the Christian miracles is widely prevalent. To reject them is thought to be the mark of an independent and philosophic mind. The notion becomes contagious. It spreads from one to another till it seizes upon those who little understand the real bearings of the question. In the remarks which I am about to make on this part of the sub-

ject, let me first state that with the Pantheist or Atheist I have now no concern. With such an one, reasoning is out of the question. Of course, if he will not admit of the existence of a personal God, of an almighty and intelligent Creator of the world, he cannot admit of the possibility of miracles. For without the existence of a supernatural Agent, there can be no supernatural agency. But speaking to those who do believe in a Supreme Will, in a conscious Governor and Ruler of the universe, I ask, What is a miracle? What do you mean by it? Do you mean by it, what it is sometimes defined to be, a violation of the laws of nature? What is law, but the established order in which the Author of all things proceeds in the exercise of his power? Now there is no violation of this law by what is properly termed a miracle. John Stuart Mill—following in this respect Dr. Thomas Brown in his Essay on Cause and Effect—tells us that miracle is no contradiction of this law. It is simply a new effect introduced by a new cause. That cause, we say, is the will of God. There is no interference between the natural connection of the *same* antecedent and the *same* consequent. For instance—take it by way of illustration—when God said, Let there be light, and there was light, what law of nature could be said to be violated? So when he said, Let the blind see, and the blind saw, what law was violated thereby? There is no question, observe, of the universality of the law of causation. The question is purely this, whether, in addition to the causes which we see in constant operation, another cause, say the will of God, has been in operation too. General physical reasoning does not really affect the question. All that such reasoning can establish is this, that if the same causes, which we see usually operating, continue to operate, certain effects will invariably follow. But this cannot tell us what effects will be produced under the influence of a new cause. If, then, the Christian miracles are rejected, it is not because of their essential incredibility, but because the evidence alleged in their favour is deemed to be insufficient for the purpose. Mr. Mill admits that miracles may be certified by our senses, or by testimony. Now we contend that we have this testimony, the testimony of those who themselves witnessed them, or of those who were well acquainted with them that did. In the narrative of our Lord's teachings and doings, the evangelists wrote on as naturally as they breathed. They speak of his wonderful works in the plainest and most artless manner, as if it were as certain that he performed them as that he was then living."

Mr. Madge places in a very clear light the relation of miracles to the religion of Christ, showing that they were wrought, "not to afford direct proof of the truth of any doctrine, but to attest a mission, to shew that he who wrought the miracle is a messenger from heaven." He also dwells with much force on the expressions employed by Christ himself respecting his authority; such are those remarkable words—"I came forth from the Father;" "I am from above;" "A greater than Solomon is here;"

"I am the way, the truth, and the life;" "I am the resurrection and the life:" and he also refers us to the language in which Christ, in proof of his mission and authority, appeals to his miracles. Had this mission been only a dream of his own excited fancy, without any proofs to sustain it, he could not have planted conviction in the minds of others; the claim which he made to divine authority would only have exposed him to contempt or pity.

In referring to the Resurrection of our Lord, Mr. Madge very happily meets the objection raised to the sacred narrative from discrepancies found in the several Evangelists, and illustrates these by the accounts given by different historians of occurrences in or near to our own time, in which, while similar discrepancies are found, we never think of doubting the veracity of the writers, or the general truthfulness of their writings. Referring to the implicit faith which the apostles had in the resurrection of their Lord, and to the effects which that faith produced in their life, Mr. Madge thus writes—

"Nothing, I think, can be more certain than that the apostles, after the death of Christ, gave out their belief, and acted upon their belief, that he had risen from the dead. This is denied by no one. From the Epistles of Paul and the Acts, says Strauss, it is certain that the apostles themselves had the persuasion that they had seen the Arisen. He repeats the assertion: from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which is undoubtedly genuine, we must admit that the apostles were persuaded that they had witnessed appearances of the risen Christ. They acknowledged, indeed, that they all abandoned him in the hour of his deep distress; that they all forsook him and fled. The death of their Master seemed to them the complete extinction of their hopes. For such an event they were totally unprepared. It completely staggered and confounded them. They gave up everything as lost, and for a brief season all appeared to be lost. But presently the scene changes. These men, disappointed, terrified, and dispersed, all gather together again, all assembled with one accord, fully recovered from the despair and depression into which they had fallen, and with a settled resolution stamped on their demeanour which never marked their conduct before, resolved to go forth and preach, as the one great and all-important fact of the Gospel, Jesus and the resurrection. They who a few days before appeared so weak and cowardly, now display the most daring and intrepid heroism; go into the very heart of the city of Jerusalem, and declare in the presence of their enemies that Jesus had risen from the dead, that they had seen and conversed with him, that he was their triumphant and glorified Master, that they never more would desert his cause, and that in proof of what they

said they themselves were ready to suffer and to die. They are surrounded by difficulties and dangers the most formidable, and yet they never hesitate, never falter—no, not even the weakest of them. They go through country after country and toil after toil, laying down their lives for the testimony of Jesus, and everywhere leaving those behind them to teach, and suffer, and die, as they had done before them. What was it then, I ask, that produced this wonderful change in the views, feelings, and conduct of the apostles, that turned their cowardice into courage, their desertion into attachment, their aim at worldly advancement into a voluntary surrender of almost every earthly comfort, their shrinking from difficulty and danger into a patient submission to almost every evil which could afflict human nature—what was it, I ask, that effected a revolution like this, but the firm conviction that their Lord was indeed risen from the dead? This, and this only, is a cause adequate to the effect produced. This explains all and accounts for all, and without this all is confusion and chaos."

The following is the conclusion of the lecture :—

"And now let me say, in conclusion, that if we are to give up everything that is supernatural in the history of Christ, we must of course strike out of the Gospels all the miracles, amounting to about thirty, together with the discourses arising out of them, or closely connected with them; we must also strike out all the language of Christ that refers to the authority which he claimed as a divine messenger; we must discard his numerous direct appeals to the miracles which he performed in proof of his heavenly commission; and we must reject the whole account of the resurrection as contained in the writings of the evangelists and the Apostle Paul. When we have made this excision, when we have cut out of the Gospels so much of what is recorded of the history of Christ, when this expurgation is accomplished, what a poor, miserable remnant will be left! And of what little is left, how are we to know whether we can place any dependence upon it, resting as it does upon precisely the same evidence with that which we have discarded?

"The result then is this—the Church of Christ and Christianity itself is founded on a fable; the apostles, in saying that they had seen and conversed with Christ after his resurrection, laboured under a delusion unparalleled in the history of the world; and the Apostle Paul, though he declared before God that he lied not, was guilty of bearing testimony to what in his heart he knew to be false. He who can believe all this, however learned he may be in the higher criticism, may fairly be charged with straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. Religion, such as the Christian, appeals to facts, and must be proved like all other facts. Apart from these facts, it is reduced to a mere system of morality, and Christ is simply a mere human teacher, instead of being that beloved Son of God, to whom the Spirit was given without measure, and through whom the Father has been revealed to us—revealed to us in all the plenitude of his grace and mercy, life and immortality brought to light, and Jesus himself the triumphant conqueror over death and

the grave. These are the facts which constitute the Gospel, the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, and these the glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people."

We have to express our hearty thanks to Mr. Madge for this able and most timely discourse. At his advanced age, when he has withdrawn very much from the active duties of the ministry, it might be supposed that he would have left the discussion of this question to younger men. The importance which he attaches to the subject has, no doubt, prompted him to take part in it; and we earnestly hope that the matured convictions of one so long and so highly esteemed in the Unitarian Church may exercise much influence in checking the prevailing tendency to unbelief.

ANNUAL REPORT OF GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCHES.

We noticed, in our August number, the annual meeting of the General Assembly of General Baptist Churches, held in Worship Street, London, on June 6th, and gave the resolution which was passed on the occasion, affirming the belief of the Assembly in the truth of the Gospel narratives, and "its recognition of the Lord Jesus Christ not only as a perfect example of holiness, but as the Divine Master whose religious teaching we are bound to receive and obey." We have since been favoured with a copy of the printed report, in which we find the following reference to the authority of Christ:—

"In the latter part of last year a violent attack was made on the constitution and character of our Churches in the pages of *The Inquirer* newspaper, which led your Committee to reprint and circulate (gratuitously beyond the limits of our own body) a sermon, preached fifteen years before, by one of your Secretaries, at the meeting of the Kent General Baptist Association, and printed at the time by that Association. It appeared to your Committee that this sermon, which is on 'The Position and Duty of the General Baptists,' was calculated both to shew and vindicate the grounds on which we feel it right to maintain our separate denominational existence.

"It is not unlikely that the bitterness of tone by which the attack referred to was characterized, was occasioned by the position which we occupy in the controversy, now so rife, respecting the divine authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. We are manifestly, by the very necessity of our position, upholders of that authority; and the constitution of our Churches, if consistently maintained, inevitably excludes the predominance of those by whom the divine mission and authority of the Saviour are disregarded or assailed. While our constitution is maintained, our Churches cannot become the seat of that so-called Christianity which rejects alike the divine sanction of Christ's teachings and the miracles by which that sanction was manifested.

"The spread of these views, so incompatible, as it seems to us, with a true conception of Christianity, is a very serious and alarming indication of the movement of public opinion; and your Committee trust that you will not separate without a clear and distinct recognition of the divine authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the truth of that record of his life and teachings which is contained in the New Testament. Few in our body have held those extreme views of the inspiration of the Bible which would invest every declaration of sentiment with divine authority, and stamp as infallibly true every minute particular of the sacred narrative. We have recognised a human element in the Bible, and have given full scope to what we judge to be legitimate criticism. But when all the supernatural is denied, and the Gospels are affirmed to be legendary records of post-apostolic date; when what we have been accustomed to regard as the very corner-stone of Christian truth, the resurrection of Christ, is looked upon as groundless imagination, natural, indeed, under the circumstances, but destitute of any basis of fact; when Jesus is spoken of as a man of no preeminence above his fellow-men but the possession of an unusual degree of spiritual insight, virtue, and holiness; and when the Christian name and a place in a Christian Church are claimed for such views, it is time for those who recognize, as it is our glory to do, a higher power and authority in the Saviour, to speak out firmly. Surely it behoves us to maintain the honour of him into whose name we have been baptized."

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIAN MISSION IN INDIA.

The following extracts from a letter of the Rev. C. H. A. Dall, of Calcutta, to the *Boston Christian Register*, dated May 17, 1865, will be read with interest:—

"For ten years the American Unitarian Association—nobly seconded in Calcutta by the English Government and by resident Unitarian Christians, as well as by Hindu Protestants and Hindu philanthropy—have promptly and generously paid their part of the costs of a successful mission. The total sum paid to support this large and healthily growing work, from May, 1864, to May, 1865, is six thousand six hundred and twenty rupees; and of this sum, *about one-third*, and no more, *i.e.*, two thousand rupees, have been paid from home, through the Association. The rest, India herself has supplied, namely, four thousand and twenty rupees. These have come to the mission chiefly from its so-called educational department, wherein idolatry, superstition, and the *shasturs* receive their deadliest blows, by fees from pupils, to the amount of two thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight rupees. A donation of one thousand rupees has come direct from the Bengal Government; and our own little church have made up the balance.

"This refers, however, only to the Calcutta mission. The equally interesting mission in Madras—though the local (Anglo-Saxon) aid to native effort is less in Madras than it is here—has this year been redeemed by Calcutta from a crushing debt, and

added to the churches of the Association. On the celebration of the jubilee and fiftieth anniversary of the consecration of the Roberts' chapel—or say, of the chapel of the high-caste native convert from heathen idolatry, *Appacooty Moodelliar*—his son, our good brother, William Roberts, after twenty years of approved service of that church, was ordained by them as their permanent pastor. This bright day in their history was the 19th of December, 1864."

NEW UNITARIAN CONGREGATION IN MONTREAL.

We learn, through an American correspondent, that a division has taken place in the Montreal Unitarian Congregation, in consequence of a liturgical service having been recently adopted. We are glad to know that the parent Society is strong enough to bear this secession; and although we regard the question on which the separation has taken place a very subordinate one, we hope that the new Congregation may aid in the spread of Liberal Christianity in Canada, and that between it and the old Society there may be hearty Christian co-operation. The following notice of this new organization appears in the New York *Christian Inquirer*:—

"A second Unitarian Church has been organized in Montreal. The first meeting for worship was held on Sunday, the 30th July. Over one hundred persons were present on that occasion in the forenoon, and about eighty at the evening service. Many Unitarians present at those services had not attended worship for months previous, and some had not attended for a much longer period. The Rev. J. R. Lavelle, pastor of the Unitarian Church, Toronto, preached on the occasion. The new Society seems full of life and energy. There is room for a second Unitarian Church in Montreal. The population of that city has more than doubled since the organization of the first Society in 1843."

OBITUARY.

Died, on September 8th, at Craigarogan, near Templepatrick, Mr. Luke Williamson, aged 51. Mr. Williamson was a most intelligent, upright, and useful man. To the Congregation of Templepatrick his death is an irreparable loss.

Died, on September 14th, at Seaview, Larne, Elizabeth, wife of Robert S. Agnew, Esq.

Died, on August 31st, at Dunmurry, Mary, wife of Mr. Robert Gibson.

Died, on September 5th, at Ballywalter, near Ballyclare, Mary, relict of the late Mr. William Simms, aged 93 years.

Died, on September 19th, at 2, Adelaide Place, Belfast, Alicia, wife of Mr. William Haffern.

Died, on September 5th, the Rev. Henry Knott, pastor of the Unitarian Congregation, Plymouth, aged 54 years.

Died, on September 24th, at Newcastle, Jessie, fourth daughter of Mr. William B. Minnis, Dromore.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] NOVEMBER, 1865. [No. 10.

A RETROGRADE PROPOSAL.

THE controversy originated by the Rev. Samuel Bache at the late meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and carried on by various correspondents in the two weekly journals of the denomination, has recently been varied by a letter from the pen of the Rev. James Martineau, in which he recommends that all sectarian distinctions should be dropped, and that we should form "an undogmatic church—a church unconditionally devoted to the pure Christian pieties and charities." He is of opinion that our brethren of a past generation committed a grave blunder in organizing a *Unitarian* Association, and thus placing, as its foundation, a dogma which is not an *essential* in Christianity: but he believes it is "not too late to retrace our steps and recover an honourable, if not distinguished, position." The high and well-deserved reputation which Mr. Martineau has long held as a scholar and a Christian minister, entitles any opinion he may express to the utmost consideration, and hence we find that his proposal, which is retrograde, inasmuch as it recommends that we should "retrace our steps," has attracted general attention, to the neglect, for the time at least, of the question raised by Mr. Bache's resolution. We believe that Mr. Martineau's suggestion has much force in it, and that, to a certain extent, it will meet with general approval. In his letter, and still more fully in his tract on "Church Life? or Sect Life?" published some six years ago, he puts forward the important consideration, that many of the congregations which are now Unitarian were formerly Trinitarian, that the principles on which they were based afforded to the successive members an opportunity of changing or modifying their dog-

matic views according to the evidence which was presented to their minds, and that the same liberty which was derived from the past we should jealously guard, and carefully transmit to our successors; that, in short, a church should be free to alter its doctrinal tenets according to circumstances, while still retaining its essential character of a *Christian* Church. He argues, very fairly, that Christianity is not Unitarianism or Trinitarianism, not Calvinism or Arminianism; and that, in the organization of a church, nothing should be placed in its foundation but that which is essential. The denominations commonly named "Orthodox" regard certain dogmatic views as necessary to salvation, and therefore they may have reason for imposing them as a creed on the members; but no Unitarian regards his own peculiar opinions as necessary to salvation, and therefore he has no such apology for embodying them in chapel deeds and fixing them as a creed on the worshippers through all coming time. Although we have not quoted Mr. Martineau's words, we believe that such is the substance of his letter, and, in our mind, it embodies important truth which in our zeal we have sometimes a tendency to overlook. We presume that the majority of the English Chapels in which Unitarian worship is now held, are what are termed "open trusts," and whether they were erected by Unitarians, or by their Trinitarian ancestors, the successive generations that may yet use them, will not be compelled to profess the dogmatic views of the present occupants, should they see reason to adopt other opinions. These churches are free. So also are our Non-Subscribing churches in Ireland. Not only so; but our Presbyteries are equally free. No dogmatic views are imposed on intrants, and our ecclesiastical organization is such as to admit all who acknowledge the authority of Scripture, whatever opinions they may hold on matters about which Christians have differed. It is true that in England all the congregations are independent; but they are not on that account prevented from forming such an association as may concentrate their efforts to promote "the Christian pieties and charities." This work belongs more particularly to each church within its own boundaries; but much might be done towards the same important end by

tracts published, and missionary labours sustained, by the united contributions of many congregations. Such, we presume is the organization which Mr. Martineau recommends —an organization which shall seize only on the essentials of Christianity, and labour to spread and deepen them in the world,—an organization which shall place in its front no repelling dogma, but present, for the instruction and comfort of us all, those beatitudes which win the homage equally of Catholic and Protestant, Unitarian and Trinitarian. And truly to cherish in our own hearts and communicate to others the spirit of piety, love, and purity which all sects recognize in the Christ, is the "one thing needful"—in comparison with which, whether for this life or that which is to come, mere dogmas are but trifles.

That Mr. Martineau does not contemplate such an association as shall supplant Christ, or place him on a level with certain heathen sages, we infer from his stating that he has "an ever-deepening attachment to historical Christianity, and distrust of philosophical religion apart from it,"—and also from the following passage in his tract on "Church Life or Sect Life":—

"*Christianity is a divine dispensation* for bringing men into conscious union with the holiest of all, with the Father through the Son; a Church is an institution embodying and applying the distinctively Christian requisites to this end,—the dying away to sin and self, and the rising into strength, goodness, and filial love by filial surrender to the Perfect Will."

Mr. Martineau always expresses himself with the wisdom, but sometimes too with the vagueness and ambiguity of an oracle. If, however, we understand him correctly, he clings to "historical Christianity" and "a divine dispensation," and, therefore, in this essentially Christian organization which he recommends, the very same question would arise which is now agitating the Unitarian Association, and it would devolve on Mr. Bache, or some other consistent and conscientious member, to move a declarative resolution, not respecting Christ's "physical or metaphysical nature and power," but respecting his authority as God's son and messenger; and this not for the purpose of exclusion, but to protect the Society from the unjust reproach and deep disgrace which a few rash and self-conceited sceptics might bring upon it.

But supposing that Mr. Martineau's proposal were carried out—what then? Are we to give up the Unitarian Association, and let the Unitarian name disappear from our vocabulary? Assuredly not. To the mind of many this "long-lost truth" of God's unipersonality, brought to light, after many ages of error, by the pious study of earnest Christian men, held and proclaimed at the risk of freedom and of life—sanctified to our hearts by the prayers and the blood of holy martyrs, is too precious to be thus abandoned or betrayed. None think of it as essential to the Christian character, or anathematize those who do not hold it; but they, nevertheless, feel that it is important, rescuing the Gospel from one of those errors which obscure it, and presenting it in a simpler and more rational form for the reception of the world. A Unitarian Association is, in any country, a standing protest against an error which disfigures the creed of the popular churches, and mars the simplicity of Christ's religion; while the books and tracts which it circulates place before every inquirer abundant arguments to show that no such doctrine as the Trinity was ever taught by Christ or his apostles. It does not follow that every non-conforming or non-subscribing minister and congregation, though at present holding Unitarian opinions, should join the Unitarian Association. Let every one in this matter please himself; but, while all should seek to cultivate "the Christian pieties and charities," and value the spirit and life of Christ above all dogmatic views, we are much mistaken if many be not found ready to plead for Christian Unitarianism, so long as a prayer to the "holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity" is found in the English Service Book, and the Athanasian Creed tempts the thoughtless and irreverent to hypocrisy or to blasphemy.

It is amusing to observe how Mr. Martineau's retrograde proposal has captivated those who, but a week before, were breast-high in behalf of a Unitarian Church on the largest basis. The editors of our weekly journals seem especially to have fallen at once into his views, and to have given themselves unreservedly to his leadership. We are far from supposing that Mr. Martineau aspires to be a dictator in the denomination; he expresses his opinions without any unbecoming assumption; but there seems to

be a general desire, whether he wish or not, to raise him into a kind of Pope. *The Inquirer*, which unsparingly assailed Mr. Bache for disturbing the peace of the Association, has suddenly discovered that he is partly in the right!

"We must confess that Mr. Bache, and those who think with him, are partly in the right. We have at least to thank them for having helped us to clear up our future position. We have long been using ambiguous and ill-defined phrases; we have clung to those phrases as expressions of common agreement about things on which we do not agree. To do this is illogical, and misleading, and mischievous in every way, and Mr. Bache has done us all good service by calling serious attention to this fact."

Mr. Bache complained that terms were employed in a sense different from that in which they had been generally understood, and he desired the Association to have them more distinctly defined. *The Inquirer* warmly remonstrated against any such attempt, and maintained that every man must be at liberty to attach his own meaning to any terms he may employ; but now it discovers that Mr. Bache is right, and that we have been using ambiguous and ill-defined phrases! But further, *The Inquirer* adds—"By all means let us have a creed as the basis of association; our Church is at fault in having none." We all remember how creeds of every kind, and without exception, have been denounced in its columns, yet now it declares that our church is at fault in having none! And what, think you, good reader, is the creed which it proposes?—"That the pure in heart are the blest of God!" and it suggests that our church should embrace "the pure-hearted of every race and creed." We hope we value as highly as our contemporary purity of heart, whether in Christian, Jew, or Heathen; but on this basis to raise a church which shall embrace all "of every race and creed" is simply nonsense; while if those only are to be admitted into the church, whatever may be their Christian profession, who cultivate purity of heart, who is to be the judge? Verily, there would then be an inquisitorial tribunal, in comparison with which an ordinary creed-test would be harmless indeed.

The Herald, equally with *The Inquirer*, welcomes Mr. Martineau as a leader, and intimates its willingness to

drop the name Unitarian "if another can be found that will better indicate the broad position of Christian freedom." It desires, however, to know more accurately whether Mr. Martineau proposes that the new organisation should be distinctly Christian, or one in which Christianity shall be left altogether an open question. It thus writes:—

"Does he propose a union on the basis of—we don't say 'holding certain opinions' about Christ's 'antecedents' or 'nature,' but of—*discipleship to Christ?* a church in which, as in all churches now, preachers and people shall start from that as their common ground of reverential agreement, in which the expressions of Christian reverence and the reference to Christ's own thought and life, shall not be looked upon as this or that man's peculiarity imported into neutral territory? or, does he propose a union of all who will worship God, and believe in righteousness (in the expectation, possibly, that they would be 'imbued with Christ's spirit' and 'teach his religion,' and 'accept his law of self-sacrifice'), but still a union in which a reference to Christ would be simply as individual as a reference to Plato, and the invitation to the Lord's Supper on a par with a proposition for a Temperance Society? We ask these questions in all earnestness and good faith. Even if the latter of these alternatives is what is meant, we have no desire to denounce it. Mr. Martineau's deep appreciation of the Christian spirit is so well known, his 'ever-deepening attachment to historical Christianity' is so plainly avowed, even in this letter, that even if it seems to him the better, *more Christian*, way to build up a church of which Christ shall be not the foundation, but only as one of the windows, there will be few who will not feel that this proposition is worth earnest and anxious consideration."

We cannot believe that Mr. Martineau will feel complimented by *The Herald* supposing him to suggest that Christ, in the new church, should be placed on a level with Plato, and the Lord's Supper on a par with a proposition for a Temperance Society; but even if such be the mind of him whose leadership it courts, and if Christ is not to be the foundation, but only *as one of the windows*, it considers the proposal to be deserving of earnest and anxious consideration! If *The Herald* is prepared to consider a church scheme in which Christ is to be "only as one of the windows," we may reasonably ask—what is the foundation to be be? Reason? or Plato? or James Martineau?

LIFE.

Life is good, for God did give it—
Good to all who rightly live it:
  Sweet affections lend it beauty;
Stirring conflict makes it grand;
  Faith triumphant makes it holy,
Leaning on the Father's hand.

Life is hidden in a chamber
Never opened to a stranger;
  There is life and strong emotion,
Thought and feeling, sacred sorrow,
  Tossing like a troubled ocean;
Faith serene, though dark the morrow.

Life is conflict, earnest, stern,
Much to conquer, more to learn;
  But above there is a helper:
Blessed voices cheer us on;
  Heavenly lights forbid to falter,
Angels shout each victory won.

Life is swift. The years go by;
A story told, and then we die.
  Still the golden *now* is ours;
And mem'ry running down the past
  Plucks again its choicest fruits—
Fruits for virtue's crown at last.

Life is good, for God did give it—
Good to all who rightly live it.
  Life is hidden in a chamber
  Never opened to a stranger.
Life is struggle, earnest, stern;
Much to conquer, more to learn.

Life is swift. The years go by;
A story told, and then we die.
  Life is glory—all things holy;
Conflict done—victory won—
Clad in white—crowned with light—
  Angel songs shall tell its story.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.

(*Continued from p.* 300).

V.—Thomas Alexander, Mr. Lewson's assistant, successor, and son-in-law, and who, on the death of his father-in-law in 1803, became fifth minister of Cairncastle, was ordained there as assistant-minister, in December, 1793. It was his first and only ministerial charge. In 1833, he himself obtained the services of an assistant. This latter event he survived eighteen years, when he died in London, on the 26th of May, 1851, aged 81 years.

Mr. Alexander was born on the 1st of January, 1770, at Knockcairn, near Crumlin. This was the original settlement of his grandfather, who came from Dumbarton with one of the early Scottish Presbyterian ministers—perhaps William Livingstone, of Templepatrick; and here, until lately, Mr. Alexander's sisters continued to reside. My old friend and neighbour was educated at Glasgow College, under the care of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, whose minutes record that on the 6th of August, 1793, "a supplication was presented from the Congregation of Cairncastle, by James Maxwell and Archibald Lusk, requesting that Mr. Alexander, a probationer under their charge, might be sent to supply them one month." This was accordingly done; and the result was, that in the course of four months he was ordained by the same Presbytery to the pastoral oversight of this Congregation. The particulars of his ordination I cannot give, as there is a lamentable gap of two years in the Minutes of the Presbytery at this period; but it appears from subsequent entries that he was ordained in Cairncastle on the promise of a stipend of £40 per annum. The first mention that is made of Mr. Alexander in the Presbytery Books, in connexion with his new Congregation, is under date November 3, 1795. At this time it is gratifying to read that the people of Cairncastle sent to the Presbytery, which met that day in Glenarm, Messrs. Thomas Brown, John Fullerton, Henry Shaw, and Thomas Silliman, as Commissioners from their Session and Congregation, who gave a most favour-

able report "respecting Mr. Alexander's deportment as a man and a minister of the Gospel." They also submitted a stated account of stipend between their minister and them, which was attested by Mr. Alexander, and by James Wilson, Thomas Sheriff, Samuel Hunter, Robert Neill, and Charles Ferris, "the Congregational Committee for the last year." This account exhibited the singular fact that the people of Cairncastle had paid their minister £1 1s. 7½d. too much!! The new broom had swept *too* clean. But this failing was soon succeeded by another, which, unlike the foregoing, did not "lean to virtue's side."

To change the subject, however, from these continually recurring statements of Congregational accounts, I may mention that in 1797, Mr. Alexander was an unsuccessful candidate—in opposition to his neighbour, Mr. Acheson of Glenarm—for the Crumlin pulpit, which was then vacant in consequence of the death of Mr. Gibson, and which, after three years' squabbling, was eventually filled by the election of Mr. Nathaniel Alexander.

I must also add, that in the following year, 1798, Mr. Alexander (of Cairncastle) shared the fate of most of the Presbyterian ministers of this neighbourhood at that time, and was subjected to a short and not very severe imprisonment in Carrickfergus, on account of his connexion with the United Irishmen of the day.* But, fortunately, arms soon gave way to the gown; and the next fact which I have to relate in connexion with Mr. Alexander, who was then sole minister of Cairncastle,

* The method of Mr. Alexander's capture, as described to me by himself, was rather amusing. A distinguished United Irishman had been for a time "on his keep" in Cairncastle; but at length arrangements were made for his escape by a vessel, which was to call off Ballygally Bay for that purpose. At the appointed time a vessel appeared, and the fugitive, accompanied by some friends (amongst whom was Mr. Alexander), hastily put off in a boat from Ballygally to get on board. But it would have been better for them if they had stayed on shore. On approaching the vessel, it turned out to be a Royal cruiser; and perceiving their mistake, the party were about to return to Ballygally, when the captain of the cruiser, politely taking off his hat, begged that, as they had put themselves to the trouble of coming so far to see him, they would do him the additional favour of coming on board his ship. An invitation given under such circumstances was not to be declined; and, therefore, making a virtue of necessity, the disappointed party went on board, when they were immediately taken round to Carrickfergus, and lodged in the county prison.

Mr. Lewson having died in 1803, is more in accordance with the peaceful character of his profession. On February 12, 1805, he was appointed by his Presbytery, in conjunction with two other neighbouring ministers, to prepare a pastoral address to the people of their charge, which was to be submitted to the brethren at their next meeting. Of this address I find no other trace in the Minutes; but if it proceeded from the pen of my venerable father in the ministry, Mr. Alexander of Cairncastle, I am sure it would exhibit all the simplicity and elegance by which his literary compositions were invariably distinguished.

Two years subsequently to the last date, viz., on May 5, 1807, a Visitation Presbytery was held at Cairncastle. On this occasion, Messrs. Archibald Lusk and Hugh Hamilton appeared as Commissioners from the Session; whilst the Congregation was represented in a similar way by Messrs. Robert Moore and James Wilson, jun. All these parties concurred in speaking of "Mr. Alexander's conduct, as a man and a minister of the Gospel," in the most favourable terms; and Mr. Alexender reciprocated the kindness, by expressing his "perfect satisfaction with the conduct of his Congregation towards him." A settlement of accounts between Mr. Alexander and his people, made up to November, 1806, was also produced, which gave a clear discharge for thirteen years' stipend, at £40 per annum, viz. £520; but also contained the following statement explanatory of the way in which the accounts had been squared. "The above settlement of accounts is agreed to, in consequence of the Congregation having resolved in February last to raise each seat one shilling, in order to prevent in future that arrear which did unavoidably take place according to the former assessment, and from which arrear Mr. Alexander now exonerates the Congregation, on promise of the increased assessment of stipend being regularly paid." This account and memorandum were signed by Mr. Alexander and the four Commissioners above-named; but it will soon be seen, as indeed it might have been anticipated, that this wholesale way of "making things pleasant" did not long continue to produce its intended effect.

In May, 1813, a meeting of Presbytery—I presume, by

way of visitation—was held at Cairncastle. Of this meeting we now know nothing, except the simple fact that such a meeting was held; for the Clerk of Presbytery, after stating this fact in the usual heading, left a blank for the remainder of the proceedings, which unfortunately he never filled up, and which therefore continues a blank to the present day, as I fear it must do to all succeeding generations.

The next Cairncastle visitation is more fully recorded. It was held on May 11, 1819,* and was attended by Archibald Lusk and William Moore as Commissioners from the Session, and by Charles Ferris and Thomas Wilson as Commissioners from the Congregation. Both

* A few years previously,—viz., in 1816,—my father paid a visit to Cairncastle, in connexion with which I have heard him tell the following anecdote. At that time he was on a canvassing tour amongst the ministers of the General Synod, preparatory to his election to the Clerkship of that Body; and was accompanied by his kind friend and neighbour, the late Rev. Richard Dill, of Ballykelly, whose name was a guarantee for all that was orthodox. The two travellers happened to reach Cairncastle on a Saturday night, and of course it became the duty of one of the party to repay the ready hospitality of the minister of the parish by preaching for him on the following day, which accordingly my father did. The sermon was one of his ordinary "travelling" discourses, and in no respect doctrinal, except, indeed, in the omission of Calvinistic doctrine. On the Sunday afternoon, Mr. Dill and my father resumed their journey, and on passing the parish public-house—which, as usual, was beside the meeting-house, for the convenience of those who "thirsted after the word,"—they observed a number of horses standing tied by their bridles to the door, thus indicating that their riders, who were some of the Elders of the Congregation, were still inside discussing and digesting the strange minister's sermon over an extra friendly glass. The nature and value of their criticism were soon made manifest. The travellers had not gone far until they heard a voice calling after them repeatedly, "Mr. Dill, dear, stop." Accordingly they pulled up; and turning round, beheld a man, whom they recognized as one of the Cairncastle Elders, and who seeing the two ministers ride past, had rushed out after them from the public-house, bareheaded. He passed by the veritable and orthodox Mr. Dill with an angry and contemptuous scowl, evidently supposing him to be the heterodox Mr. Porter; and grasping my father warmly by the hand, he said: "Mr. Dill, dear, come in; do come. It's a long time since we have heard the Gospel preached in this parish the way you preached it to us to-day. My heart warmed to you when I heard it. Come in, and just take one glass with us for the sake of that darlin' sermon." My father of course declined to accept the venerable Elder's hospitality, when offered for such a reason; and he and his companion laughed not a little at the ludicrous mistake. Verily, there is something in a name. The sermon which, when it was supposed that the preacher was Mr. Dill, passed off as intensely orthodox, would have been at once condemned as rank heresy, if it had been thought that the preacher was Mr. Porter.

sets of Commissioners declared their perfect satisfaction with the conduct of Mr. Alexander; and the Commissioners from the Congregation also stated, with respect to the Session, that it was "small, but respectable." The report, however, which the Session made of the Congregation was not equally favourable. They "lamented the neglect of the Congregation in their attendance upon divine worship;" and Mr. Alexander, when interrogated on the same point, likewise expressed a similar feeling. The minister characteristically added the utterance of "his earnest desire that things might be better in future;" and the Session had the candour to testify on behalf of the people of Cairncastle, that "those of them who did attend public worship remained in the house during the entire service," which was not by any means a common practice in the Presbyterian Congregations of those days. As to pecuniary matters, the consideration of them was, at Mr. Alexander's request, deferred until next meeting, "in the hope that they would then be able to produce a satisfactory account;" and the Presbytery concluded the day's proceedings by recommending an immediate increase of the Session, and also exhorting the people to "attend more regularly upon divine service than they are now in the habit of doing."

At several subsequent meetings of Presbytery (which, however, were not Visitation Presbyteries) the subject of the Cairncastle accounts was successively postponed, at the joint request of Mr. Alexander and his people, in the hope that they might be able so to arrange those matters between themselves as to allow them to present a satisfactory statement to the Presbytery. But the delay had not the intended effect; for at their meeting in Carrickfergus, on October 17, 1820, "the Presbytery received a letter from Mr. T. Alexander stating that the Congregation had not fulfilled their contract (in the matter of the increased assessment of one shilling on each seat), and that the accounts in future would be brought forward in the usual manner." Soon afterwards, however, affairs assumed a more promising appearance; for after repeated promises and postponements, and perhaps in consequence, to some extent, of the Presbytery's urgent remonstrances with the people of Cairncastle, Mr. Alexander was at

length able to state, at the meeting of Presbytery which was held in Islandmagee, on October 16, 1821, "that at a meeting of the Committee of Cairncastle, which took place since last meeting of Presbytery, he had been paid the full amount of the compensation money agreed upon by him and the Congregation, viz., Forty Pounds," and this was attested by John Murphy and Thomas Tweed, who appeared as Commissioners from Cairncastle. The agreement between Mr. Alexander and his Congregation, which was thus fulfilled, is stated to have been as follows: "That all past arrear, and what might in future become such against them, was liquidated, but that Mr. Alexander reserved to himself the right of calling on individual hearers." This, in my humble opinion, was a most injudicious arrangement, both for pastor and people. It encouraged the former to employ, and enabled the latter to disregard, personal solicitations, which, in the matter of stipend between a minister and his Congregation, should always be most scrupulously avoided. In the case of Cairncastle, I believe this arrangement was attended with the very worst results.

On August 1, 1826, was held a Visitation Presbytery in Cairncastle, the minute of which I give almost entire, because it contains a good deal of information on Congregational matters, recorded in a manner which is exceedingly characteristic of the gentleman who was then the Clerk of the Templepatrick Presbytery—the late Rev. Robert Campbell, of Templepatrick.

August 1, 1826.—"The Congregation of Cairncastle had notice of this meeting, and of its being a Visitation Presbytery—Commissioners from Session, William Moore, Joseph M'Cloy; from Congregation, Robert Moore, and Campbell Wilson. Mr. Thomas Alexander having withdrawn, Commissioners from Session expressed themselves satisfied with his conduct as a member of society, and a minister of the Gospel of Christ; also with his public duties in the pulpit. He preaches twice in summer, and once in winter; visits from house to house, and in his visiting catechizes; also in the Schools, and visits the sick when called on. Congregation attends to public worship better than formerly by a good deal. They might attend better, and Commissioners wish they would. They attend on Sacramental occasions very well, and have three Tables in summer and winter. Congregation amenable to the Session. Tokens of admission to the Lord's Table not used, the practice laid aside many years ago. The prophane and scandalous not admitted to the Lord's Table. Such

would be rejected by Minister and Session. The Commissioners from Congregation also satisfied. Have never heard complaints against the Minister. The Commissioners from Session made a correct statement. The minister visits the Congregation, was engaged lately in visiting, has not yet completed the visiting of the Parish, is attentive to the sick, and visits them without being called on. The conduct of the Session is agreeable to the Congregation. They are regular in their attendance on public worship, and on Sacramental occasions. They were appointed in the Congregation, who were asked if they approved of them, and they publicly accepted their appointment.

Mr. Alexander being now called in, expressed himself satisfied with the Session in every particular. There are seven members of Session, whose names are William Moore, Joseph M'Cloy, John Gibson, Patrick M'Kee, William Hunter, William Moore, Jun., and Samuel M'Kee. Congregational attendance not so good as could be wished for. They attend better than ordinary on Sacramental occasions. Young Communicants examined one day particularly set apart before admission to the Sacrament. Number of families connected with the Congregation nearly 200. Number of Contributors to Stipend nearly 159. Poor's money given to the poor exclusively, and distributed weekly. The Congregation shew a becoming respect for the Sabbath. Mr. Alexander remains perfectly satisfied with the arrangements previously entered into, and the Congregation appear equally so. There is a Committee who assist Mr. Alexander in collecting, when he calls on them. In 1812, James Wilson, of Ballygally, bequeathed the sum of £100, or the interest thereof, to the Presbyterian Minister for the time being, and nominated the Minister and Committee his Trustees for the same. He also bequeathed the sum of £59, or the Interest thereof, for the education of poor children in the Congregation, of which the Minister and the Committee for the time being are Trustees,—both which sums are secured on his property in fee. Tenure of the meeting house, a lease in fee, which is registered. There are in the Parish two Schools in connexion with the Kildare Place Society, and also two others."

(*To be continued.*)

A CHALLENGE ACCEPTED.

In a letter to *The Inquirer*, occasioned by the controversy between the editor of that journal and Mr. Panton Ham on the foundation principle of the Christian church, the Rev. James Martineau challenged the latter gentleman to make good his assertion that there are persons who maintain that "*Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church, and term of Christian fellowship;* explaining *where* and *by whom* that opinion has been maintained, and *quoting the words* which express it." In

a second letter Mr. Martineau affirmed that "he had often seen this obnoxious opinion *imputed*, but *had never seen it maintained*;" and added, that "*no one more heartily despises than he does the proposal to raise a church on the mere basis of Free Inquiry.*" Mr. Ham did not think proper to accept the challenge. The inference which I draw from these premises is, that both Mr. Martineau and Mr. Ham have forgotten several things, not of very ancient date, which attracted a good deal of attention at the time of their occurrence. Had Mr. Martineau borne them in memory he never would have thrown out the demand and made the statement which we have just quoted from his pen. Had Mr. Ham retained a distinct recollection of the details on which his assertion was founded he would have been at no loss to bring forward specific proofs of its correctness. As the matter is of historical importance, I propose to refresh the memory of both the reverend gentlemen; by showing to Mr. Ham that he was perfectly right in his original statement, though he did not happen to have his proofs ready in its support; and by showing to Mr. Martineau that he was exceedingly rash in throwing down a challenge which any one moderately well-informed on the question would have taken up with the certainty of gaining a complete triumph. For my part, I do not pretend to have even seen probably the tenth part of what has been written and published on the subject; and I am quite certain that many things which I have seen, that had a very direct bearing upon it, have escaped my memory, leaving only a general impression of their tenour and tendency: nevertheless, I can give to Mr. Martineau some specific examples of the kind which he demands,—showing that the "*obnoxious opinion*" which he so "*heartily despises*,"—and which it is unnecessary to say I also despise,—has actually been broached; and giving, as he requests, the person by whom, and the occasion on which it was broached, and the very words in which it was conveyed.

1. I begin near home. In the year 1857, the Rev. David Maginnis, then minister of York Street congregation, Belfast, now of Stourbridge, in Worcestershire, published a discourse entitled "*A Review of some Provisions of the New Constitution and Discipline of the Remonstrant*

Synod of Ulster;" in the 16th page of which are the following words:—"FREE AND FEARLESS INQUIRY *is the ground-work of the Church we are now preparing to build*: 'PROVE ALL THINGS' *will be the motto inscribed on its front in letters of gold.*" (Capitals and italics as in the sermon.) It is true that Mr. Maginnis gives these words as a quotation; and the quotation is so garbled as to be equivalent to a forgery: still the words, *as they are above set forth*, are published by him as the expression of a sentiment which he himself adopts, maintains, and defends; and they convey, almost in terms, the "obnoxious opinion" which Mr. Martineau "does not remember ever to have seen maintained."

2. My next example is from a disciple, friend, and fellow-labourer of the reverend gentleman just referred to—namely, Mr. Robert M'Calmont; a leading member of the congregation of York Street; one of the Commissioners whom it deputed to seek, in its name, admission into the Presbytery of Antrim; and the Elder who represented it at the meeting of Presbytery by which Mr. M'Alester's motion was "*rejected with indignation.*" This distinguished person declared, in the month of February, 1862, in the school-room attached to the Unitarian Chapel at Girvan, and in the presence of the Rev. Matthew Scott, Mr. John Coulter, Mr. John M'Intyre, and others, that his object, and that of those with whom he was associated, was "*to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense;—a church which should admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos and Mahometans;—a church from which not even Atheists should be excluded;—and in which a minister, if he became an Atheist, should not be called on to resign.*" Here is another case in point. To be sure, a quibbling sophist might say that the example is not apposite, because Mr. Martineau's challenge speaks of "*the Christian Church*:" and Mr. M'Calmont of one which should not be "*exclusively* Christian." But this would be mere word-fighting, for assuredly nothing can be more certain than that both Mr. Maginnis who was its minister, and he who is its elder, claim to be, the first a Christian minister, and the second a Christian elder; and that the church of which they were the pillars and ornaments, would consider

itself grossly outraged if it were not recognised as a Christian Church. Mr. Martineau, I am persuaded, will not stoop to such an evasion.

3. But both Mr. Maginnis and his elder may be considered as "small deer;" though the transactions in which they were engaged made their sayings and doings widely known, not only throughout the United Kingdom, but in remote colonies, and in the New World. *Paullo majora canamus!* The head of the so-called "liberal" party in the Non-Subscribing Church in Ireland is the Rev. Samuel Craig Nelson, who, for his eminent services to the body, was, upon the disruption of the Antrim Presbytery, chosen as its Moderator; and who was, in the following year, re-elected; a rare and almost unprecedented honour. It was while he held this office, that he wrote a letter for publication in the Boston *Christian Register*, which appeared in that paper on the 6th September, 1862. In that letter he asserts, that the reverend body over which he presided is "*bound by no creed whatever:*" that it requires in its ministers and members "no test of belief whatsoever as a condition of religious communion:" and that "*their essential bond of union is* FREE INQUIRY." Here is a third, and still more authoritative declaration of the principle which Mr. Martineau so decidedly condemns and so heartily despises.

4. Nor does Mr. Nelson stand alone in this avowal. Mr. Martineau's friend and correspondent in the Ballyclare case, the Rev. John Porter, asserted the same thing in a speech which he delivered during the next year, at Moneyrea; viz., on the 31st of March, 1863. His words were, "ABSOLUTE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY *is the principle of the Presbytery of Antrim.*" The same principle he avowed in another speech at the same place on the 29th of December, 1864, in the course of which he asserted that the reverend body of which he was then, and is now, the senior member and the clerk, is perfectly unshackled in all matters of belief and opinion; and that its members enjoy perfect, entire, and absolute liberty on all religious questions whatsoever. The exact words of his last speech I am unable to give, the report of it having been, for some cause or other, suppressed; but there can be no doubt, that they were to the foregoing purport,

for they occasioned a long and rather warm debate at the meeting at which they were spoken, and their general effect dwells still in the memory of many who heard them. At all events, the speech of 1863 is undeniable; for it was published in the newspapers at the time, where Mr. Porter must have seen it; yet never was the accuracy of the report questioned by himself or any one else.

5. These examples lie close at hand; but let it not be supposed that such statements are confined to the Green Isle. I may advert to the principle of church union laid down by the Rev. Jeffery Worthington, in his reply to an address of welcome, presented to him in the name of the neighbouring ministers, at the religious service on occasion of his settlement in the Unitarian congregation of Bolton, Lancashire. In the course of it he says,—"I thank you for the very kind welcome you have given me, as a minister of the CHURCH OF CHRIST; *that living Church*, UNFETTERED BY CREED, BY TIE, OR BY ANYTHING! A CHURCH WHICH HOLDS AS ITS MEMBERS *the good and the true* OF ALL AGES AND OF EVERY AGE!" At the delivery of this address, Mr. Martineau himself was present; for he was at the meeting, and delivered an admonition to the congregation on the occasion. Doubtless it had escaped his memory when he penned his challenge to Mr. Ham; and more especially when he wrote that he had often seen the obnoxious opinion in question imputed; but had never seen it maintained. If he had not seen it, I think at least he must have heard it. It was certainly heard by a large congregation of ministers, on an occasion of especial gravity,—the Rev. J. H. Thom, the Rev. J. J. Tayler,—Mr. Martineau himself being of the number; and it was heard without a word of dissent,—the suggestion of a doubt from any one present!

6. I shall only give one more example; indeed, to ransack the columns of magazines and newspapers in search of such precious *morceaux* of liberal theology, is no very pleasing task; and, besides, I have already given enough of them, and occupied enough of the space in this periodical. Perhaps the example I am about to give may not be considered by Mr. Martineau quite in point, for its authority, on second thoughts, applied a limit to the very broad principle which he at first laid down. I take it from

one of the speeches delivered in the Court House of Ballyclare, on the 18th of November, 1861, at a public dinner given to Mr. John Dundee, and afterwards published in a pamphlet form. Mr. Martineau will, doubtless, remember having seen this pamphlet; at p. 36, I find the following:—

"It is very wonderful how liberal the ideas of some are respecting church government. Some time ago, I was in conversation with a minister who occasionally preached in Christian pulpits. He talked fluently about the 'Broad Church;' almost every sentence had something about the 'Broad Church.' At length I quietly asked him what he meant by the 'Broad Church?' 'Why,' said he, 'I would include in the church men of all opinions, without regard to their *isms*. I would have in it Roman Catholics and Protestants, Calvinists and Arminians, Trinitarians and Unitarians, Jews, Mahometans, and Deists.' 'And Atheists?' I added. 'Yes,' he replied, 'and Atheists. But no,' he said, 'on second thought,—for they do not worship God.'"

It is true the name of the person who recommended the erection of such a "Broad Church" is not given in this extract, but it is at Mr. Martineau's service if he wishes for it.

Now, I admit that this gentleman did not carry out the basis of his "Broad Church" consistently, to its full breadth, in accordance with his original design. Still, he extended it far enough to merit a place for himself in this catalogue of ecclesiastical reformers. In truth, the exclusion of Atheists could scarcely be regarded as an infringement on "absolute religious liberty:" for they would not desire to enter a church of any sort, narrow or broad, seeing that every church must recognise worship—the worship of God—as one of its functions; and Atheists could not be expected to join in worship to a Being whose existence they deny.

I had intended to add a few words respecting the principle of church union laid down by Mr. Martineau himself, in some recent letters, but other occupations put it out of my power to enter upon that question now; and I am not without hopes that it will be taken up by some one more competent to do it justice. Meanwhile, I would advise all whom it may concern to pause before they adopt a principle which the eminent man who has been appealed to on behalf of the Unitarians of England to prescribe for them a rule of church polity and a principle

of church union, [Qu. *Did not our Blessed Lord do this for us* 1800 *years ago*?] denounces as contemptible and despicable in the extreme.

J. Scott Porter.

THE GOSPEL IN THE WORDS OF CHRIST.

If we were asked what are the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel we might refer the inquirer to the teachings of Christ, and exhibit them as there they may be easily learned from his own lips. Those teachings, so far as they have been recorded, are contained in the four Gospels, not systematically arranged, so that we could turn to a particular part of the record for all that our Lord taught on a particular subject, but scattered here and there over the pages of the four Evangelists. They seem to have dropped from his lips as opportunity offered, or as incidents suggested them; but, wherever they are uttered, they seem to be with power, and to have around them the fragrance of heaven. As he lingered in the scenes of his childhood, or visited other towns and villages of Galilee, or went up at stated seasons to the great city, he was ever bent on sowing the seeds of that divine truth which he was sent to reveal and to publish to the world. Sometimes a trifling incident afforded him an opportunity of uttering some beautiful and precious truth; a question asked by an earnest disciple or a captious opponent drew forth the holy promise or the solemn warning; and at times, when many had been drawn to him by some mighty work which he had performed, he instructed them in sermons such as never before, and never since, have fallen on human ears, or awakened and captivated human hearts. The themes on which he spoke were just those which we might expect in "a teacher sent from God." He heeds not the party politics which divided and inflamed the people; he passes over the trivial matters about which Jewish sectaries disputed; on objects and pursuits which are only worldly, he does not touch; but the grand and holy truths which it is needful for men to know, the great and solemn duties which it is incumbent on men to perform, everything which pertains to man's true usefulness and real happiness here, everything which concerns his

blessedness hereafter, our Lord teaches, illustrates, and enforces, so that the humblest disciple may understand. He speaks of God, his nature, his character, and his will, —of man, his worth and his duty, his responsibilities and his dangers,—of the future life, its reality, its glories, and its terrors. Christ teaches us plainly of God. He reveals him as spiritual, not material, in his nature. There has been in every age a tendency to think of God as possessing, to some extent, the limitations, weaknesses, and partialities which belong to finite humanity. Hence the disposition in many nations to regard particular places as exclusively enjoying his presence, and particular forms of worship as exclusively acceptable to him. As Jesus talked with a Samaritan woman at Sychar, and excited her attention and inquiries, he uttered that sublime truth on which the wisest and holiest men have since pondered with admiration and awe—"God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." The outward form, the ceremony, the holy place, signify nothing: the soul of man must give its spiritual affections to God —this only is true worship. Farther, he continually exhibits God as our Father, not merely as the author of our life, but as an ever-watchful and ever-loving parent, whose care and compassion extend to all his children, whatever may be their condition or their conduct. To this parental character there are no limits. Men forget him, disobey him, blaspheme him, but still he loves them. If any should doubt whether God be the all-loving Father, let him remember that Christ rests on this feature in God's character the argument for men loving their enemies. God loves his enemies; "He maketh his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." In many ways he minutely teaches God's will, but he embodies it in the two great commandments, which, in an earlier age, had been taught to the Jewish nation, and which our Lord endorsed and illustrated, sweeping away the restrictions and limitations which Jewish Rabbis had placed around them, and holding them forth for universal imitation and guidance.

The things which God has made seem to reveal his power and handiwork; "the heavens declare his glory;" but who by seeking can find Him out? How much there

is to perplex and puzzle! In the rude representations which men have made of God, in the human passions and weaknesses they have attributed to him, in the deeds of cruelty committed against others, or in the sufferings inflicted on themselves, by which they have sought to please him, in the theories of refined intellects, by which they have either ignored his existence, or confounded him with the universe which he created, and which he sustains, we see how vainly they have sought to find him out. Well that one should come from heaven, carrying with him the seal of God's authority, to teach us that He is a Spirit, a Father, loving all his children, and requiring that we should love Him, and love one another.

And on the teaching of Christ rests our worship of God, and our prayers to him. Filled with a sense of his greatness and goodness, we would in deep reverence pour forth our devotion, not as some, in a spirit of undevout criticism have said, to tell God of his greatness, but to give expression to sentiments that are glowing within our own hearts, and seeking for utterance,—like the gushing springs that rise within the mountain, and seek vent through every crevice of the rock. As we read Christ's revelation of the Father, how natural that we should worship—not necessarily raising for that purpose a vaulted cathedral, or bringing to our aid a gorgeous ritual, but that we should worship with the fervent and grateful feelings of the soul—worship any where, and every where, "in spirit and in truth." And as Jesus teaches us that the invisible One is our Father, and brings us as it were by the hand into his nearer presence, how natural that we should pray—not for worldly or sensual objects, for riches, or honour, or even health; but that we should pray for faith and grace, for guidance and help—that in this world, dark and bewildering, we may keep the narrow way, and live as his obedient, loving, trusting, and submissive children.

Not of God only, but also of man, Christ teaches us—of his worth, his duties, and his responsibilities, his prospects, and his dangers. He teaches us to think of ourselves as precious in our Father's sight—objects of interest to the dwellers in celestial abodes; not as creatures formed merely to live their brief time on earth, like the flower, the insect, or the beast, but as creatures, within a

frail and mortal body possessing an immortal spirit. Such a life our mental capacities suggest, and such a life our Lord plainly reveals. And while thus he teaches us our dignity, he distinctly exhibits the duties that devolve on us. We pass over the duties of loving God and loving one another, simply observing that God, as revealed by Christ, is a being whom we may truly love—kind, merciful, compassionate, and forgiving, with no trace of injustice or cruelty to repel; and that Christ lays no limit on the duty of loving our neighbours, but shows, by various apposite illustrations, that no diversity of nation, or creed, or condition, should straiten our beneficence or repress our charity. He urges on us the duty of humility, and teaches that, in the sight of spiritual beings, he is greatest who stoops to the humblest task for the benefit of others. To those who from the higher life looked down on our Lord as he lived on earth, his character did not shine forth more beautiful when he calmed the angry billows, or called back to life the departed spirit, than when he washed the feet of his disciples. And he shows us that, to be true to God and ourselves, we must be ready to crucify all unholy desires, and practise a rigid self-denial, wherever indulgence would interfere with the duty we owe to God and to goodness. If sin should come in its most attractive or seductive form, we must resist it. To every temptation, however alluring, we should say—"Get thee hence, Satan." And as sin, in many forms, is ever seeking an entrance into the heart, we should obey our Lord's word, and *watch*, lest we enter into temptation. How earnest are our Lord's entreaties, and how solemn his warnings, when he speaks of the duties that rest upon us, and the dangers to which we are exposed.

Of another subject which transcends the limits of human investigation, but which has, nevertheless, in every age tasked human ingenuity to penetrate, our Lord speaks—we mean *the future life*. Many things which, in a ruder age, seemed to be beyond human effort to accomplish, have yet been in later times achieved—the discovery of the laws that regulate the heavenly bodies—the navigation of the widest oceans—the almost instantaneous transmission of thought from land to land; but the future life is beyond the sphere of human observation or experi-

ment. He whom God hath sent reveals to us that spirit land. He speaks of it as one who knew its reality, who understood the bliss of its angelic inhabitants, who felt the brightness of its glory resting upon his soul, who saw, in its blissful mansions, a rest and a reward for the struggling children of mortality. He speaks not merely of the bliss that is there, faintly imaged in the joy that blesses virtuous homes or thrills through the breast of God's children here; but of the misery that is there—feebly pictured in the torments that hellish passions bring to human souls on earth. He tells us of a judgment and a retribution, and as he speaks, our souls are filled with awe; we think of the terrors of the Lord, and we pray that we may be persuaded to seek the better part at any sacrifice, and to lay hold on *eternal life*.

Christ taught "as one having authority." He did not, like human philosophers, build up a system of ethics by argument and deduction; nor did he present a body of divinity, reasoned out from the nature of things or their fitness; but he uttered his doctrines and precepts as so many truths, about which there was no question and no doubt. Our Lord is a *dogmatic* teacher. He does not simply give us his opinion as one which may be right or possibly may be wrong, but he speaks with authority. "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God." Jesus either had a direct and special mission from God as the Great Teacher, or he was the most presumptuous of human instructors. "I am the light of the world." "I am the way, the truth, and the life." "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." In the same breath in which he utters his teachings, he declares his authority. That authority is expressed by the title "Christ," or "anointed." If we accept his authority, we receive and rest on his words as the truth. If we deny that authority, we reduce his teachings to a level with those of mere human instructors; and those sublime precepts to which modern society has so far conformed itself, and those blessed hopes that have cheered the soul in scenes of sorrow, tribulation, and death, are the mere notions of a good and gifted, but fallible Jew! We accept his authority, and make a faith in the Christ the foundation of our religious views and hopes.

See the Gospel in Christ's words:—God our Father—man our brother; God, a spirit to be worshipped, not by outward forms, and rites, and sacrifices, but in spirit and in truth, in heart and in life. Man to be loved—every man, no creed or climate, rank or condition to dry up our charity; humility to be cherished in the heart, and self-denial to be practised in our life. Man—the heir of an immortal life—of its glories or its terrors, according to the deeds done in the body. Such is the Gospel that comes from Christ's lips, beautifully harmonising with that which is presented in his life. If we have faith in it and its founder, let us obey it. The more we do so the more shall our faith in its divine authority grow; for we shall find that it is adapted to all the circumstances of our life, fitted to promote our peace and our usefulness, to lift us into communion with God, and to prepare us for a blessed inheritance above.

S. S. R.

SOME EDITORIAL ERRORS CORRECTED.

We thought it right to fix attention, in our last number, on an editorial article which recently appeared in *The Unitarian Herald*, in which the writer finds fault with those Unitarians who "talk about the *Holy* Scriptures," "call Christ their Saviour," and "offer up their prayers through Jesus Christ." One of the editors of *The Herald*, signing himself B. H.—we presume the initials of his name—takes us somewhat angrily to task for our criticism, accuses us of having a keen scent for heresy, casts up to us the origin of our humble Magazine, and, prudently passing over the important statements and exposures which our article contained, undertakes to correct certain errors into which he supposes we had fallen. Any exhibition of temper into which B. H. has been betrayed we can readily understand and excuse, for it is indeed humiliating for a Christian minister to find himself leagued in an editorship which can publish sentiments so irreverent and offensive as those which we have noticed; but then he should visit with his displeasure, not the critic who exposes an objectionable article, but his brother editor who wrote it. Whether we have any peculiar quickness of perception in detecting heresy we really do not know, for of late sceptical opinions are so frequently and broadly uttered in connexion with our denomination, that the most simple and unsuspecting perceive and are pained by them.

We desire in all good temper to show B. H. wherein he errs in his endeavour to correct us; but first let us inform him that he quite mistakes the origin of *The Christian Unitarian*. It did not arise "out of the attempt to prevent some of our body from being

recognized as Unitarians"—its originators freely acknowledge the Unitarianism not only of all of every class who belong to our body, but of many besides, including all Jews, all Mahommedans, and those Deists who are too conscientious to connect themselves with a professedly *Christian* Church. The origin of our Magazine was twofold—first, a desire on the part of some earnest members of our Church in Belfast and the neighbourhood to maintain Unitarian Christianity, free from the undermining influences of scepticism, which, in certain quarters, had beset it; and also to defend our cause and its friends from the injustice and abuse with which they were treated, to some extent in *The Herald*, but more liberally in *The Inquirer*. B. H. alleges that we misrepresented the author of the article criticised, when we said that "he finds fault with those Unitarians who speak of the Scriptures as Holy and call Christ their Saviour." Perhaps to a small extent we did; for we should have said that some who use such phrases he stigmatizes as *hypocritical humbugs*—others in our softer phrase, "he finds fault with"—and a third class, who avoid such old-fashioned terms, he represents as "bold and industrious thinkers:" in which of the classes he includes his co-editors we have no means of determining; but, beyond these three classes of Unitarians, the article refers to no others. We should mention that, in a subsequent article, published after some unfavourable comments had appeared, the writer endeavours to qualify what he had written; but to such qualifications we attach no value; and B. H. is in error when he accuses us of misstatement in the matter: he would have been right if he had charged us with understating it.

We alleged that the author of the criticised article evidently considered the Scriptures as ordinary writings, containing some truth and much fiction, some wisdom and much folly; and we suggested that, to carry out his own recommendation of "definite action," he should remove the volume from his pulpit, or select the lessons and texts occasionally from other writers. B. H. accuses us of misrepresentation here, and assures us that his friend "approves of the practice of selecting the lessons from the Bible, and believes that parts of the Bible are the most religious writings in existence." Be it so; but how then have we misrepresented him? He places the Scriptures on a level with other good books; there is some religious writing in it—some very religious writing; so there is in Channing's Sermons, and in Tennyson's Poems; but the one has no more *authority* in his mind than the other, and therefore we repeat, that for consistency's sake he should not give exclusive prominence to the Bible; it must be inconvenient for him, in reading the Evangelists, especially on an Easter Sunday, to avoid all that is legendary and false; and he might, according to his view, vary the pulpit lessons by an occasional passage from the meditations of a heathen philosopher, or the orations of one of our advanced thinkers. In the laudable desire of B. H. to defend his partner we do not mean to charge him with misrepresentation, but merely to show him that he is in error in bringing such an accusation against us.

B. H. deems us ungenerous for finding fault with the tardiness of Dr. Beard in disclaiming agreement with the offensive article, and

for hinting that he may have taken this step because he found that in various quarters it had given offence. But look at the facts of the case. Four weeks elapsed before Dr. Beard's disclaimer appeared. In the mean time, various letters had appeared in *The Herald*, finding fault with it; many parties had privately communicated with the editors, some complaining and expostulating, and others withdrawing their names from the subscribers' list; and then Dr. Beard writes a letter disowning participation in the objectionable leader! Under these circumstances, there was surely nothing ungenerous in the suggestion we made.

But we are informed that the two other editors also repudiated the unfortunate article. When we read this, we frankly confess that it surprised us, for we had never heard of it, and turning over to *The Herald* to which B. H. referred us, we did find, printed in the smallest type, thrown into a foot note, and timidly retiring from public observation, the following modest disclaimer:—

"It ought to be stated, that both the articles referred to, 'Definite Thought, Speech, and Action,' and, 'Speaking the Truth in Love,' were expressions of individual opinion on the part of one of the editors, not shared in by any of his colleagues."

Had we seen this note, it would have modified, not prevented, our reference to two of the editors as being silent on the subject. We should not certainly have accused them of acquiescing, but still we must have blamed their silence. They should not have remained, week after week, under the suspicion of agreeing in opinions so thoroughly sceptical, nor have tamely permitted themselves to be parties to their circulation. When, some time ago, an ungenerous attack was made in the columns of a contemporaray on one of their co-editors, they stepped forward, with an *esprit de corps* which we admired, to protect their injured friend. In this article, he whose disciples and ministers they profess to be was dishonoured in their own columns, and they were silent for three—four weeks—and then such a disclaimer as they put forth! The occasion demanded an indignant protest—not a faint whisper buried in a foot-note.

We hope B. H. will pardon us for correcting an error into which he has fallen in alleging that offence was given by the article on Definite Thought, not for its own views, but because they were misunderstood as adopted by the editors generally. Offence was given because of the article itself, without regard to the particular writer, and we are greatly misinformed if the editors did not receive letter after letter of complaint. *The Herald* aimed at a commendable object in seeking to give expression to the various sections of opinion in the Church; but when, under that plea, opinions directly conflicting with Christianity are promulgated, the character of the journal is greatly and most seriously damaged. Whatever of a Christian element there is in the editorship cannot satisfactorily co-operate with the sceptical, and we would, therefore, respectfully recommend the dissolution of a partnership which can do no good, and may continue to work much mischief.

EXCLUSIVES AND INCLUSIVES.

[The following communication from a most valued correspondent did not reach us in time for publication in our last number. The queries, however, which he proposes are not less pertinent now than they would have been at an earlier date.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

There is a controversy going forward in the *London Inquirer*, concerning "Exclusives and Inclusives," the nature of which must be not a little puzzling to those of your readers who are not conversant with that periodical. The shortest explanation that can be given is, that "Exclusive" is a term invented to represent all who think that those who repudiate, directly or by implication, the authority of Christ should not be allowed to co-operate with those who admit this authority, in promoting those truths and principles by which Christians are contra-distinguished from all others. The term "Inclusive" is meant to represent the principles of those who would break down all doctrinal partitions, and include all men of a good moral character under the same category, and embrace them all as Christian brethren and as fellow-workers in the Christian cause; considering it as a matter of indifference whether they believed that Christ had any special authority to communicate God's will,—whether he is to be believed when he claims miraculous powers in support of this authority, or has any peculiar claims to inspiration more than Socrates or Plato, Cicero or Seneca.

This general question has been of late considered in more particular reference to the "British and Foreign Unitarian Association," the first rule of which is, that "the Association is formed for the promotion of the principles of *Unitarian Christianity* at home and abroad,—the support of its worship,—the diffusion of biblical, theological, and literary knowledge on topics connected with it,—and the maintenance of the civil rights and interests of professors." And the fifth rule is, that "until otherwise resolved, the following shall be considered as one of the leading divisions of its objects, viz.:—The promotion of *Unitarian* worship in Great Britain, by assisting poor congregations, and sending out or giving assistance to missionary preachers," &c. &c.

It surely marks some idiosyncrasy, or peculiar conformation of the mind, to be unable to see that these fundamental principles prove the original founders to have been most decided "exclusives" of all that would secretly and treacherously undermine Christianity, as well as of those that carry their doctrinal views to an opposite extreme. We might suppose that even the obtuse obstinacy of the *London Inquirer* could hardly have resisted the conclusion to be drawn from these premises.

It is in reference to this controversy that the following pertinent queries are forwarded. Assuming the principles of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association to be the same that were agreed to originally, and that, according to their 33d Rule, they were to admit of no addition or alteration, except at a general meeting, the follow-

ing queries seem to bear strongly upon the points at issue between the Exclusives and the Inclusives:—

1. Does not the definition of a Society except or exclude all who do not come within the terms of the definition?

2. Does not the promotion of *Christian knowledge, missionary preaching*, and *Unitarian worship* exclude those who openly or tacitly disavow this as being a sectarian object?

3. Could these objects be promoted by a Committee opposed to all lines of demarcation? or can there be any line of demarcation that does not exclude those who are beyond that line?

4. Can there be any *Unitarian* institution (as the British and Foreign Association is) that does not exclude Trinitarians?

5. Can we fairly admit into association with us, for Christian purposes, Deists or Atheists, and refuse or expel Trinitarians?

6. Is it not true that one congregation at least has excluded a Trinitarian or Arian minister, although his "best thoughts" had led him to change? and must not the same congregation, supposing it to be one of the Inclusives, be ready to admit, without question, an unbeliever in the truth of the Christian religion, and are there not other congregations that would follow the same course under the same circumstances?

7. Is it not very absurd to profess to require a Christian basis in one sentence, and in another to maintain that there should be no limitation of thought, or no basis at all: to unsay in one sentence what has been said in another?

8. Do the Inclusives mean to include Deists or not? If they do, what is there to distinguish Christianity from pure Theism? If not, must they not admit themselves to be Exclusives?

9. Are not Unitarians so called to distinguish them from Trinitarians, and are not Christians so called to contra-distinguish them from unbelievers, whether their "best thoughts" have led them to be Deists, Pantheists, Atheists, Mahommedans, or Jews? and must not the term Christian, therefore, exclude all these, as the term Unitarian excludes the Trinitarian?

10. Does it not follow, from all these considerations, that *Exclusion* must begin somewhere, and that the main difference is whether the line of demarcation shall be visible or invisible, intelligible or unintelligible; indicating sincerity, or cloaking insincerity?

QUERIST.

INTELLIGENCE.

BOLTON DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The half-yearly meeting of this Association was held at Park Lane, near Wigan, on Thursday, September 28th. The chapel was well filled. The devotional services were conducted by the Rev. Jeffery Worthington, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. T. Hirst Smith. After the service tea was provided in the school-room. A hymn having been sung, the chair was taken by David Shaw, Esq., who opened the meeting with a cordial welcome to the friends

present. Various resolutions having been passed, thanks were voted to the chairman. The secretary, Rev. J. Worthington, read the minutes of the last meeting, which were confirmed.

COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE NON-SUBSCRIBING ASSOCIATION.

At a meeting of the General Committee of the Association of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland, held in Belfast, on Wednesday, the 11th of October, 1865,—the Rev. J. Scott Porter, President of the Association, in the chair,—it was moved, seconded, and resolved unanimously—"That, inasmuch as the Association of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland has always been friendly to the principles of united and non-sectarian education, and has frequently expressed its attachment to that principle, we, its Committee, acting on its behalf, feel bound to record our deep regret at an announcement which we understand has been made by her Majesty's Government, intimating an intention to reconsider the Regulations of the Queen's University in Ireland, with a view to modify them in such a manner that young men who have been educated in a seminary which is under the control and patronage of one particular Church, and whose directors and teachers are required to be members of that Church, may be enabled to receive degrees and other literary and scientific distinctions in connexion with that University; that we deprecate the adoption of any measures for the purpose above set forth as a direct infringement of the great principle upon which the Queen's University was founded; as likely to lead to further and still more objectionable changes in its constitution and management; as disadvantageous if not fatal to the prosperity of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland; and as calculated to counteract the wise and beneficent measures which the Imperial Parliament has, during the last thirty years, repeatedly sanctioned with reference to public education in Ireland; to produce a deeply injurious effect on the feelings and habits of the rising generation; and to foster and perpetuate sectarian jealousies, alienations, and animosities in this already distracted land."

RADEMON SUNDAY SCHOOL.

On Tuesday evening, October 24, the annual entertainment of the children belonging to the Remonstrant Sunday School, Rademon, took place in the National School-house, and was largely attended. After tea had been abundantly supplied, the Rev. W. Crozier, pastor of the Congregation, took the chair, and commenced the proceedings by briefly stating the object of such meetings, and expressing his gratification at the presence of so many of his young friends. He paid a well-merited tribute of respect to the memory of Mr. Hans Graham, the zealous superintendent of the School for so many years. The Rev. C. J. M'Alester, who favoured the meeting with his presence, gave an appropriate and interesting address on the importance of the Sunday School work. Several pieces of music were admirably sung by the precentor of the Congregation, Mr. James Murphy, and some of his musical friends

from Downpatrick. Various amusements were introduced which contributed greatly to the enjoyment of the young people. After the Dismission hymn had been sung, the chairman closed the meeting with prayer. The arrangements for the evening were all well carried out by the superintendent, Mr. James Martin, and the managing Committee, and gave general satisfaction.

OBITUARY.

DEATH OF WILLIAM HAMILTON DRUMMOND, D.D.

We have to record, among the events of the month which has just closed, the decease of the Rev. Dr. Drummond, of Dublin, who died at his house in Lower Gardiner Street, on Monday the 15th of October, 1865, at the age of 87 years. For some years he was, in consequence of infirmities caused by his advanced age, withdrawn from public duty, and even from the society of those who loved him best; but his character, his talents, and his services were such as claim more than a passing notice.

His father was a medical man of great talent and promise, who died at an early age, of a fever caught in the discharge of his professional duty at Ballyclare, where he practised. He was cut off before it was in his power to make any provision for his wife and family, consisting of two sons and a daughter; but the untiring energy and self-devoting affection of his widow enabled her, by the exercise of her talents, to compensate to her children, in a great measure, the premature loss of their other parent. She gave to both of her sons an education which prepared them for professional life, and was well rewarded by their enduring attachment to herself, and by the eminence which they both attained. Her eldest son, William Hamilton,—so named after the lamented Dr. Hamilton, author of the "Letters on the Northern Coast of the County of Antrim," whose genius and untimely fate he afterwards commemorated in his own beautiful poem on the *Giants' Causeway*,—was at first intended for business; but in consequence of a disgust occasioned by the inhuman treatment to which he was subjected in an English commercial establishment in which he had been placed as an apprentice, he changed his views, and sought a more congenial profession in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. He entered the College of Glasgow under the auspices of the Presbytery of Armagh, then a Non-Subscribing Presbytery in connection with the General Synod of Ulster; but after three years' study at the University, placed himself under the care of the Presbytery of Antrim, by which, after a short series of examinations and trial-discourses, he was licensed to preach the Gospel on the 9th of April, 1800, "having declared that he would make the Scriptures the sole rule of his faith." The licensing address was delivered by the venerable Dr. Bruce. Almost immediately afterwards, Mr. Drummond received a call from the Congregation of Holywood; and a few weeks later, another from the 2nd Congrega-

tion of Belfast, one of the most important worshipping societies in the North of Ireland; the latter invitation he accepted, and was ordained to its pastoral charge on the 26th August, 1800, being then barely twenty-two years of age. Notwithstanding his youth, and his still more youthful appearance, his ministerial gifts soon gained him much distinction at a time when all the pulpits in Belfast were filled by eminent men, and his great attention to the preparation of his discourses and religious services deserved the approbation which they received. From the first day of his ministerial life he made it a rule to deliver no discourse or address from the pulpit until he felt that it was as good as it was in his power to make it. In the selection of subjects for charity-sermons, and the treatment of those selected, he was especially happy, and the benevolent institutions of Belfast profited largely by the results of his eloquence. His preaching was not doctrinal. It is believed that during the whole period of his incumbency in Belfast he only delivered one controversial sermon, and that not of his own motion, but at the earnest solicitation of a respectable member of his flock, who still survives, and who was anxious to hear the sentiments of his minister on a subject which had occupied much of his own thoughts.

Soon after his ministerial settlement, Mr. Drummond married; and in order to provide for the requirements of a rapidly-increasing family, he sought an addition to his income by opening a boarding-school which was popular and profitable, but interfered in some degree with the pastoral duties of his profession. His poetical tastes were the means of withdrawing him from them still farther: but his high talents and wonderful industry counteracted the effect of these disturbing causes, and his ministerial usefulness remained undiminished in circumstances which would have deprived most other men of all their influence and popularity.

He had early begun to cultivate the society of the Muses. Before he left College he published, anonymously and without a date, his *Juvenile Poems*, the first of which is an Address to that learned Society. In 1797 appeared "*The Man of the Age, a Poem*, by William Hamilton Drummond." The incidents of this little piece remind the reader of those in the *Beggar's Petition*, while the style and versification are evidently modelled on those of Goldsmith's *Deserted Village;* but the whole is written with a manifest leaning to revolutionary doctrines, and no one can be surprised to learn that in the dreadful year which followed, it nearly cost the author his life. Within a few months after the death of Lord Nelson appeared *The Battle of Trafalgar, a Poem;* which, though not adjusted to the technical rules of art, contains some pieces of most animated and pathetic description, and in passages is instinct with Homeric fire. This was soon succeeded by *The First Book of T. Lucretius Carus on the Nature of Things, translated into English Verse* (1808); which would have been followed by a translation of the entire work; but the project did not fall in with the taste of the time, and met with little encouragement; still the part which was published attracted the attention of a considerable number of persons whose approbation counterbalanced the neglect of the multitude. Among these was Dr. Percy, Bishop of Dromore, the

friend and associate of Johnson, Burke, Goldsmith, and Sir J. Reynolds, at whose solicitation the University of Glasgow conferred on her gifted alumnus the degree of Doctor in Divinity. His heterodox tendencies were well known; but at that time the Senate of the University was not subjected to the strict surveillance which would now render the bestowment of that honour on a heretical divine a moral impossibility. Dr. Drummond's next publication was *The Giants' Causeway, a Poem* (1811). It not only abounds in beautiful and accurate descriptions of scenery, but displays a perfect acquaintance with the philosophical theories which had been framed to explain the phenomena of the Causeway and the neighbouring coast.

In the month of November, 1815, Dr. Drummond received a unanimous call from the Congregation of Strand Street, in the city of Dublin, to become one of its ministers, as colleague to his friend, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) James Armstrong. Of this call he determined to accept; and accordingly resigned the pastorship of the Second Congregation, over which he had presided for fifteen years. His motives for doing so were misunderstood by many. It has been said that he was dissatisfied with some members of his flock who, being on the Joint Boards of the Academical Institution, had voted against him when he offered himself as a candidate for the chair of Latin and Greek in the College Department. There is no doubt that some of them did so; influenced in part by the coldness, if not opposition, with which he had viewed the project of the new seminary, and in part by their dread lest the occupation of his time and thoughts on the duties of his professorship should withdraw him still farther from the intercourse with his flock in which all Presbyterians so much delight. But there was no breach of friendship between the parties: and the writer of this notice was assured by Dr. Drummond himself, that in determining to remove to Dublin, he was influenced by considerations of a totally different nature: the lightening of his ministerial labours by the assistance of a colleague in whom he reposed the fullest confidence; the consequent opportunity of carrying on his literary pursuits with less interruption, and with the advantage of access to the splendid libraries and to the learned societies of the metropolis; and, above all, by the hope of being instrumental, by his presence in the literary and social, as well as political, capital of Ireland, in diffusing more widely the principles of a more liberal, enlightened, and tolerant theology than was then in vogue. Nor was he utterly disappointed in this expectation.

It was within two years after his settlement in Dublin that the death of the Princess Charlotte of Wales (1817) plunged the nation in grief, and called forth an *Elegiac Ballad* on the subject from his prolific pen. This was followed by a poem on the Christian Beatitudes, entitled, *Who are the Happy?* (1818), to which were appended some other religious poems. Among these were about thirty hymns, all of which are of great merit, and some of them among the best in the English language. All the collections of hymns that are now employed among Unitarians, and some hymn-books that are used in churches and chapels where the doctrines of Unitarianism find little favour, are enriched by pieces borrowed from this publication; and had

their author never penned another line, he would have earned by it alone the gratitude of the churches. Soon afterwards he published, though anonymously, *Clontarf, a Poem* (1822), and *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland, a Poem* (1826). In 1835 appeared, with his name, *The Pleasures of Benevolence, a Poem;* and many years later, *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy*, being a selection of poetical translations from the works of certain bards of the olden time, whose compositions, however, were quite unworthy of their translator's genius. This was the last of his poetical effusions that was given to the world. A translation of Oppian was announced, but never appeared.

But in thus grouping together the poems of Dr. Drummond, we have anticipated the chronological order of his publications. It was after his settlement in Dublin, in the maturity of his years and his reputation, that he came forward as a writer on theological controversy; and his very first work on that subject shewed that a redoubtable champion had stepped into the arena. This was his justly celebrated essay, entitled, *The Doctrine of the Trinity founded neither on Scripture nor Common Sense, but on Tradition and the Infallible Church.* This remarkable production, equally distinguished for learning, logic, and eloquence, had a success which seldom attends publications on the Unitarian side of the argument, having gone through three large editions in the United Kingdom, and at least one in America; and it is still read and quoted, while the replies, of which several appeared,—and some of them by men of distinguished ability,—have all sunk into oblivion. In rapid succession he gave to the world—*Unitarian Christianity the Religion of the Gospel; Five Letters to the Earl of Mountcashell* (1828). —*Unitarianism no Feeble and Conceited Heresy, demonstrated in Two Letters to His Grace the Archbishop* [Magee] *of Dublin* (1829). —*Reason the Handmaid of Religion; a Discourse preached at the Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association* (1829).—*The Unitarian Christian's Faith; a Discourse* (1830).—*One is Your Master, even Christ* (1831).—*Original Sin an Irrational and Unscriptural Fiction, dishonouring God and demoralizing Man* (1832).—*The Paternal Character of God—and Truth the Parent of Liberty; Two Discourses preached before the Scottish Unitarian Association* (1833).—*A Learned Indian in Search of a Religion; a Discourse occasioned by the Death of the Rajah, Ram-mohun Roy* (1833).—*Tritheism Exposed; a Letter to the Congregation assembling in Union Chapel, Abbey Street* (1834).—*Explanation and Defence of the Principles of Protestant Dissent; a Letter written in consequence of the meaning attached to that term in a Recent Decision of the Court of Chancery* (1842).—*Supreme Religious Worship Due to the Father Only; a Reply to the Rev. Dr. Urwick.*—*Fur Prædestinatus*, translated from the Latin of Archbishop Sancroft. Among Dr. Drummond's controversial publications we may include his *Life of Michael Servetus* (1848), though its form is historical. The value of these writings is still great, and, at the time of their appearance, it was inestimable. Their learning and ability were confessed by many who espoused very opposite views from those which they defended. It was acknowledged by many of Dr. Drummond's opponents that in the field of controversy he had never met

with his match; and unquestionably his writings did much to check the virulence of an intolerant orthodoxy which was then rampant, and to bring about that external peace which our churches at present enjoy.

But religious controversy by no means occupied the whole of his attention. The sermons which are above enumerated are no fair samples of his ordinary preaching, which was eminently devotional and practical; they were discourses called forth by the events and circumstances of the church, and were every one published in compliance with requests from his auditors; but we are not without hopes that some others of a different stamp and a more permanent value may yet see the light. Of these, his admirable discourse on *The Union and Reciprocal Influences of Science and Religion* (1835), his sermon entitled *Humanity to Animals the Christian's Duty* (1830), and his *Funeral Sermon on the Death of the Rev. Dr. Armstrong*, may be taken as more fitting examples. They have the charm of mingled gentleness and power which indicates the hold that the sentiments which they inculcate exercised on his own heart. When we have mentioned his *Essay on the Rights of Animals, and Man's Obligation to treat them with Humanity* (1838), and the *Biography* of his friend, Archibald Hamilton Rowan, we have completed the enumeration of all his writings that occur to our memory, except some which appeared in the periodicals of the day, and in the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy. Of the latter, his *Essay on the Poems ascribed to Ossian* by Macpherson, and as they appeared in Gaelic, under the auspices of the Highland Society, gained him the honour of a prize, carried off from many distinguished competitors.

We have spoken largely of Dr. Drummond's writings, because he was pre-eminently a literary man, and it was by his eminence as such that he was chiefly distinguished. On surveying the long catalogue of his publications, it is impossible not to be struck with the richness of his mental stores, as well as with the vigour and fertility with which he poured forth the acquisitions and creations of his genius. He scarce left any department of human thought untouched; and all that he touched he adorned. Take him for all in all—as a scholar, a theologian, an orator, a poet—it is no disparagement of any living man to say that he has not left his equal behind him in the denomination of which he was so long the *decus et tutamen*—the ornament and the champion. Nor were his private virtues less eminent in their sphere than those talents which attracted the admiration of the public, though, of course, less generally known. In thinking of his character, the lines of Pope rise to the mind—

> "Of manners gentle and affections mild,
> In wit a man, simplicity a child."

Never did a purer or more sympathetic spirit animate a human form. One of his most vehement opponents in controversy speaks of him personally—in the very same sentence in which he denounces his doctrines with an unmitigated virulence—as "the learned, virtuous, and amiable Dr. Drummond;" and it is to the credit of all concerned that, among his many theological antago-

nists, he had not a single personal enemy. It is needless to add that his friends were attached to him by ties of no common strength. His nature was eminently social. Though taking a less active part in mixed society than his conversational talents would have justified, his presence diffused joy in all companies in which he mingled; and none of those who enjoyed the privilege of his society will forget the hearty, ringing laugh with which he received every outbreak of innocent hilarity, or the unaffected sympathy which he manifested for every tale of sorrow. "He rejoiced with them that did rejoice, and mourned with them that wept." In the domestic circle his affectionate nature manifested itself on every occasion. Even in advanced life, he was among his children rather as an elder brother than a parent, and his affection was well requited by those on whom it was lavished.

But alas! the time came when the mind so clear and brilliant was doomed to experience an eclipse. In consequence of a succession of apoplectic attacks, his memory some years ago began at first to weaken, and afterwards to fail almost entirely. Still, there were occasions on which there were brief coruscations of the wit that once flashed joy and gladness around the social circle; and for a long time his kindly affections showed themselves as strong as ever for those he had known and loved. Gradually, he ceased to know even his nearest and dearest, and life became an intellectual blank. This is no place to speak of the unceasing tenderness which watched beside him, anticipated his every want, and soothed, as far as human care and love could soothe, his every pain. At length, kind nature gently drew the veil over an existence here, which, if protracted, would only have been one of suffering, and the pure and gentle spirit left its frail tenement to ascend to its kindred sky. He died, as has been stated, on Monday, the 16th of October, 1865, and was interred in Harold's Cross on the following Friday.

Dr. Drummond was twice married. By his first wife, Barbara, daughter of —— Tomb, Esq., of Belfast, he has left, besides several children who died in infancy, a son, William Bruce Drummond, Esq., of Dublin, and two daughters; and by his second wife, Catharine, daughter of Robert Blackley, Esq., of Dublin, two sons, the Rev. Robert B. Drummond, minister of St. Mark's Chapel, Edinburgh, and the Rev. James Drummond, junior minister of Cross Street Chapel, Manchester; and a daughter married to John Campbell, Esq., of Copeland View, Belfast.

Died, on September 30, at Tours, France, George M'Intyre, Esq., of Belfast, aged 31 years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Comunications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arrhur Street, Beifast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] DECEMBER, 1865. [No. 11.

GO A-HEAD!

AT the time when *The Christian Unitarian* was set on foot we saw that a spirit was at work in our Unitarian churches, as in others, the result of which, if unchecked, would be to cast aside the old landmarks of faith altogether; a spirit which, while professing to reform the Christian Church, and in the name of Christian liberty, aimed at throwing overboard all reverence for Christianity itself, all deference to Christ as an authorised teacher, all respect for his doctrines as authoritative expressions of the Divine mind. We saw the workings of that spirit in many of the conflicts which disturbed our ecclesiastical associations in the North of Ireland. We were perfectly aware that, while several of those who took their stand on the principle of rejecting all profession of faith in Christ as a necessary qualification of the ministry in the Church of Christ, were, nevertheless, firm believers themselves in his divine mission as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world, some with whom they were associated in the assertion and advocacy of that principle carried their views much farther, and were led to raise the cry of *No creed*, in the hope that they might thereby the more easily introduce into their respective churches the doctrine of *No Christ!* With them, *No Test of Belief* was the same as *No Belief at all!* They joined in the cry of "Absolute Religious Liberty," in the hope of paving the way for *Absolute Liberty to reject all Religion in the Church* as well as *out of it*. From time to time, we raised our voice to warn our fellow-Christians of the precipice to the verge of which they had been conducted, and over the verge of which some sought to entice them, under the delusive idea that they

were only asserting their own and their brethren's "freedom in Christ;" and we foretold that a time would soon come when the grand idea (as it appeared to so many) of "*No Questions asked!*" would culminate in the open denial of the Son of God, the reviling of the sacred Scriptures, and the casting of doubts on the existence and providence of Almighty God himself.

Circumstances have verified our apprehensions much sooner than we could have anticipated, and in a much more signal manner than we expected. Clearly as we thought we saw the coming crisis, we own we did not apprehend that it would so soon make its presence felt by utterances *from the pulpit;* and these not vague, nor hazy, nor indefinite; (to such voices we have for some time been well accustomed); but clear, decided, and striking. We believe the language of the pulpit in not a few places in the sister island is often characterised by a distinct rejection of all belief in anything supernatural; and that the tendency to such preaching is manifested with especial openness and frankness by some young ministers who come forth from the seminaries where they have enjoyed the instructions of the most eminent teachers of religion whom our denomination possesses. Some time ago, a correspondent wrote to us to express the surprise with which he heard one such young minister declare from the pulpit that "*the Bible is the great Fetish of the Age;*" that "*the miracles of Christ are Fetish;*" that belief in a future state is, "perhaps, *only a sign of cerebal disease;*" and that "*the existence of a Deity cannot be proved.*" (*Christ. Unit.*, ii., 260.) But these were merely *words spoken;* it might be said that they were thoughtlessly uttered; they might be misunderstood; they might, perhaps, have been modified or qualified by something which our correspondent had failed to catch. At least, these things might be said. But when a discourse, preached before a professedly Christian worshipping society, is given to the world in type, with the preacher's name and the name of the chapel on its title page, and thus invites the criticism of the world, there is no longer room to doubt the lengths to which some are prepared to go, and others ready to follow; and of this reckless spirit of innovation we have just received a sample. We feel that

it may be useful to some into whose hands this magazine may fall to let them understand the drift of the discourse to which we now allude.

It is entitled—"*Shall we not go forward? A Discourse delivered in the Unitarian Chapel, Bridgewater*: by WILLIAM CHATTERTON COUPLAND, B.A., B. Sc." Mr. Coupland, we find, was, not long since, one of the alumni of Manchester New College, London, and in the last annual report of that celebrated institution is catalogued in the roll of honour as one of its most distinguished students; and doubtless went forth with the proper credentials and testimonials from its conductors. We presume he gained an entrance to the pulpit of the Unitarian Chapel, Bridgewater, "without any questions asked." Certainly, if any inquiry was made respecting his religious views they must have been of the most meagre description, or those who made them must have been very easily satisfied. Mr. Coupland "*fancies*" (so he expresses himself) "that all the life which this English generation possesses comes"—from whom? From Jesus Christ? from Paul? from Martin Luther? no; but—"*from Thomas Carlyle!*" "The burning torch was taken up by Emerson, and from Emerson passed to Parker, and kindled an undying flame on the other side of the Atlantic. So in France, Ernest Rénan has lately revivified the theologic dry bones by publishing that glowing life of Jesus which has electrified this time; a work full of errors, doubtless, but which must be measured by its life-breathing spirit. Strauss is far sounder, but Strauss gives no life." "We live," he tells us, "in a favoured age, but I do not think we make the most of it; nor can we, until we unreservedly *place ourselves in the prophetic rank*. We must discard all traditions, set no store by precedent, work out anew for ourselves. So we go through the routine of all sects, though we have no affinity with them. We are not a more liberal branch of the Church of England, or the Congregationalists, or the Methodists; but we are a New Church, whose rock is human nature, and whose temple is the personal soul." "Popes *and Bibles* were indispensable and valuable under other conditions of society, but now those conditions are changed: Popes and *Bibles rather hinder than help us!*" "Protestantism means by a

Bible, a document containing a set of Divine commands necessary for all time, and a set of beliefs which it is absolutely incumbent on us to believe, whether our reasons say 'Aye' or 'No.' Protestantism repudiates all homage to a Catholic Pope, and *we repudiate all homage to a Protestant Bible.*" "I would have our Sunday services utterly remodelled, permit a greater elasticity in the arrangement, abolish the stereotyped monotony of hymn, prayer, &c., time after time. *I would have absolute liberty here as in the thought.*" "One sees that I have little sympathy for our conservative gentlemen. I abhor conservatism; it is to stop short at animal existence; it being the great characteristic of brute as differentiated from man. But, of course, there is always the response—'The time is not ripe.' And when, pray, in your wisdom, will the time be ripe? When will the time be ripe to say . . . '*a Bible is a hindrance to human life!*' Who does not see that each generation puts up the same plea, and will put it up as long as the world lasts; but it is evident that, if the plea had not been disregarded, we should have had no Christianism, no Protestantism, and no *Spiritualism* (!!!) *I do not know that I can altogether rank myself in this Theism of modern spiritual philosophy*, much as I share its great principles; but (as I suppose) it will be the next step in the progressive march, and the '*Church of the Theists*' *will take the place of the* '*Church of the Apostles.*' Whether, however, this or any other church succeed the dilapidated Christianism presented on every hand, new forms must arise for new ideas, and old rituals perish with old beliefs." "Perhaps the Unitarians are quite right to regard their mission as ended, and the New Society is to be built up out of the wrecks of all churches, and to collect its disciples from the longing multitudes of every fold. Better so in truth; for *I find no satisfaction in a church which staggers backwards and forwards, not knowing its own mind.*" (There is some sense in this last declaration.) "A church, such as I conceive of it (it will be no *church* indeed, for that term bears its phenomenal sign on its front), will be a community of joyous wayfarers, *men who worship the Ideal* (!!!) under no form or all forms, and whose bond of union is a common sigh after Ever-

lasting Perfectness. The indispensable acknowledgment among such a society must be *unconditional liberty—a liberty which shall have no intellectual bounds—which, both in word and act, renounces every creed, and the condition of membership solely a confession of individual and social imperfection.* When we have such a 'church' as that, I think the nations will flock thereto as to the 'Hill of the Lord,' and malice and uncharitableness will die away. In such a community the spirit of God must be permitted to blow where it listeth; yea, even though it be doubted to be a spirit of *God* at all—[italics as in the original]—and through every story of earth and Heaven shall the human mind press, proving and questioning. In such a society nought shall be secular and *nought be sacred*, the triumphal march holy as the hymn, and the silent meditation grateful as a prayer. Chiefest of all shall the thoughts of *great men of all time and every clime* be spread before a hungering people, and whoever, in India or Arabia, England or Syria, have stood closest to the skies shall be esteemed venerable and listened to as a Heavenly seer." "You smile, perchance, at this dream; but is it to be ever a dream? and must the world wait another millennial cycle till the thought become a deed? Who knows? I should think we should not wait long *if some among us were more earnest.*" We shall conclude these extracts with one in which the writer expresses his belief, or, we should say, his conviction, respecting his own origin:—"I have never hesitated to avow the conviction that the only conceivable explanation of man's creation lies in regarding him as *the progressive child of the highest catarhine primates*," that is to say, of the apes, whose nostrils are directed downwards. We do not quite agree with Mr. Coupland in the pedigree which he claims, but we must admit there are some men—and ministers, too—whose intellectual manifestations remind us, at times, very strongly of the monkey tribe.

Here, then, we have the most recent illustration of the "relation between Christianity"—we beg pardon, Christian-*ism*—"and modern thought," as presented to us by the utterances of the British Unitarian pulpit. Who can wonder if all religious Christian men and women—all who have any reverence for their own nature, any venera-

tion for their Saviour, any love for the blessed Bible, any holy awe for their God, any thoughtful conviction of existence, should flee from a church which permits, and sanctions, and adopts such teaching, as they would from a city infected with the plague? If such be Unitarianism, the sooner it falls to the ground the better for our race; and if such doctrines are taught and published in its name without repudiation or rebuke, we have the satisfaction of believing that it will come to the ground very soon. Scoffing preaching will drive away all but scoffers, and no church or congregation that was supported only by scoffers ever yet made way or held its ground in the world. A religious institution which can gather into its fold none but irreligious men will soon come to nought.

We submit these extracts to the thoughtful considerations of those in our neighbourhood who have been enticed by the senseless cry of *Religious Liberty in danger!* (when no one had the least thought of invading it) and who have rashly and wrongly allowed themselves to be led blindfold, so as to cast off the ancient and salutary custom of their churches, which required intrants into the ministry to give some account of their faith in God and Christ before undertaking the pastoral office. If young men like Mr. Coupland are to be ordained among them, "*no questions asked!*" in what a condition are their own spiritual interests and those of their families and fellow-worshippers placed! In what a perilous position is their Church placed!

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. IV.—CAIRNCASTLE.

(*Continued from p.* 338.)

THREE years after the Visitation of Cairncastle Congregation in 1826, as recorded in our last, *i.e.*, in 1829, took place the Remonstrant Secession from the General Synod of Ulster. On this occasion, Mr. Alexander, of Cairncastle, cast in his lot with the Remonstrants; and, considering the circumstances of his worldly and pastoral position, we must admit that his doing so was highly

creditable to his Christian courage and integrity. At the meeting of the Templepatrick Presbytery, in Ballynure, on November 3, 1829, when he and the other four senior members of that body retired from communion with their former co-Presbyters, he addressed the assembled multitude "at considerable length" (as stated in the Belfast *Northern Whig* of the period), "and to the same effect" as his namesake, Mr. Nathaniel Alexander, of Crumlin, who preceded him; but *The Whig* expressed its regret at not being then able to give his speech, and I do not think it was ever afterwards published. At this trying juncture, Mr. Alexander, of Cairncastle, was nobly sustained by a compact body of supporters in his congregation, but he was just as persistently withstood by a considerable number of his former hearers, who disapproved of his conduct in this matter, and who, finally seceding from his ministry, formed themselves into a new congregation in connexion with the General Synod of Ulster. For some time, the contest between these two parties in Cairncastle was exceedingly warm; and more than once the peace of the neighbourhood was seriously endangered. But these hostile feelings have now, I trust, died away. Indeed, many of the actors in the stirring scenes to which I allude have themselves passed from off the stage; and, therefore, in proceeding to give a short account of what took place at this period in the history of the Cairncastle Congregation, I may hope that I shall be able to do so without re-kindling the ashes of an extinct animosity. This it would be as far from my wish, as it is from duty, to do.

Within a month of Mr. Alexander's secession from the General Synod, as above recorded, a protest from a large number of the Cairncastle Congregation was presented to the Synodical Presbytery of Templepatrick, which met at Ballynure, on December 1, 1829. In this paper, the protesters expressed their disapprobation of their minister's conduct in withdrawing from the Synod of Ulster, and also stated their reasons for desiring still to continue in connexion with that rev. body. At the same time, they presented a memorial signed by eighty-eight persons, supplicating to be supplied with preaching at as early a day and as often as might meet the convenience of the

Presbytery. Mr. Alexander, who was present at this meeting of his former co-Presbyters, and heard these documents read, requested that a copy of the names attached to the memorial might be given to him, which was granted, on condition that Mr. Alexander would consent to place the pecuniary records of the Congregation in the hands of two impartial individuals. To this condition Mr. Alexander declined giving any reply. The Synodical Presbytery then proceeded to consider the memorial, in support of which Messrs. Patrick M'Kee, Sam. Moorehead, Will. Moore, James M'Kee, Henry Shaw, and Stewart Beggs appeared as Commissioners. Its prayer was immediately and unanimously granted by the Presbytery, who expressed themselves bound to afford every facility to carry the spirit of it into effect. They further resolved, at the suggestion of the Commissioners, to hold an adjourned meeting in Cairncastle, on Tuesday, the 8th instant, to take such steps as the case might require; and, in the meantime, ordered a copy of this their resolution to be sent to the Session Clerk of Cairncastle, to be read in the meeting-house on next Lord's day.

On the day above named—viz., Tuesday, December 8, 1829—the Synodical Presbytery met in Cairncastle, according to appointment. They demanded admission into the meeting-house, which was refused by Mr. Alexander, on the ground that the Congregational property was vested in him as the representative of the last surviving trustee named in the lease of 1761, viz., his predecessor and father-in-law, Rev. John Lewson. The Presbytery then asked if he had any objection to their meeting in another house adjacent, which was situated in a corner of the meeting-house green, and which had been erected and used as a masonic lodge-room.* Mr.

* This building had been erected on the congregational property in 1813, as an inscription beside the door-post testifies. To this proceeding, Mr. Alexander, who was, I believe, himself a Freemason, gave his hearty leave and concurrence. At the time when he did so, many of the Congregation objected—very properly, as I think—to such a use being made of part of the meeting-house green, and I can well imagine that, in 1829, these persons would feel a sort of satisfaction in observing the unbrotherly purpose to which this building was then perverted, against Mr. Alexander himself. In fact, in this case, their minister, like many another, had made a rod to whip himself. The

Alexander replied that he had none; and accordingly in the lodge-room, which is a building of very moderate dimensions, the Synodical Presbytery met and transacted their business. The meeting lasted for upwards of three hours, during the course of which Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Reid of Carrickfergus, at the request of the above-named Cairncastle Commissioners, explained to the persons assembled the nature of the Synodical overtures of 1828. Appointments were also made to supply the Cairncastle memorialists with preaching every Lord's day; and the Moderator (Mr. M'Kay, of Ballynure) was ordered to preach there on next Sabbath, the 13th instant, which he accordingly did "to a numerous congregation in the lodge-room, many remaining outside who could not find room within." This is very probable, for the building would not hold more than fifty people.

In the meantime, those of the Cairncastle Congregation who adhered to Mr. Alexander's ministry took no part in the above proceedings, although they were present at the meeting-house in large numbers. They reserved themselves for the following Monday, December 14, 1829, which was to be *their* field-day, and when the five senior ministers of the (former) Presbytery of Templepatrick, who were all Remonstrants, together with their Elders, held their first meeting at Cairncastle, and constituted themselves into a new Presbytery, under the name of "The Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick," which still continues. On this interesting occasion in the history of the Remonstrant Church, the Rev. N. Alexander, of Crumlin (according to the report in the Belfast *Northern Whig* of December 21, 1829) preached an excellent and appropriate sermon from Luke xii 57. Rev. Mr. Glendy was chosen Moderator, and Rev. R. Campbell, of Templepatrick, Clerk. The proceedings, which were of great importance, were listened to with eager attention and much apparent satisfaction by a crowded audience; and

masonic lodge-room of Cairncastle still stands where it was erected more than fifty years ago. It is at present in very good repair, and, I am told, has been the scene of some interesting events in the local history of the mysterious fraternity who statedly assemble there. I may add, that the other Presbyterian Congregation in Cairncastle has also its building, adjacent to its meeting-house, for the celebration of secret rites. Its name is the Protestant Hall.

afterwards the Presbytery were entertained at dinner by forty of the most respectable and influential inhabitants of the parish—John M'Culloch, Esq., in the chair, and Campbell Wilson, Esq., croupier. All the persons present expressed their warm and sincere attachment to their minister, Rev. Thomas Alexander, and their determination to support him in his endeavours for religious freedom.

But all this did not discountenance the opposite party, who, on the day immediately following this clerico-social meeting, *i.e.*, on Tuesday, December 15, 1829, sent Commissioners to the Synodical Presbytery, which met that day at Ballycarry, with a memorial praying for a continuance of the administration of the ordinances of religion amongst them, and also expressive of their willingness to submit to arbitration their claims to an interest in the congregational property. The prayer of this memorial was granted, and some conversation took place on the other subject to which the memorial referred, but nothing eventually came of these threatened legal proceedings, nor of other proceedings, less legitimate, by which it was endeavoured to get possession of the meeting-house, either by stratagem or force.

A fortnight afterwards—viz., on December 29, 1829—another meeting of the Synodical Presbytery was held at Glenarm, at which there appeared as Commissioners from the Cairncastle (Synodical) Congregation, William Hamilton and Samuel Brown, who stated the only communication they had to make to the Presbytery was that, having heard that Mr. Alexander had publicly declared, at a meeting of the Remonstrants held in Cairncastle, that there were only seventeen seatholders who had gone off from him in the late separation, they had written a letter to him contradicting this assertion, and calling on him for a fair and impartial poll of the Congregation, to ascertain on which side the greater number of seatholders existed, and to this letter they had received no reply.

I need not now follow this matter much farther. Suffice it to add, that on March 20, 1830, at Ballynure, Thomas Caldwell and James M'Kee appeared as Commissioners from Cairncastle (Synodical) Congregation,

and submitted to the (Synodical) Presbytery a stipend-list having 121 signatures, jointly paying £45 14s 2d towards the support of a minister; and that not long afterwards Rev. James Carmichael was ordained by the (Synodical) Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the (Synodical) Congregation of Cairncastle, of which he was the first, and is the present, minister. The meeting-house and school-house of the new Congregation are in the immediate neighbourhood of the meeting-house and school-house of the old society. They are just on the opposite side of the road. The parish public-house continues to occupy its old position, and is common to them both.

Shortly after this peaceable separation of the two parties in the ancient Presbyterian Congregation of Cairncastle, Mr. Alexander and his faithful adherents set about improving their meeting-house and congregational property. The house, like other old Presbyterian meeting-houses, had been originally in the form of a cross; but the parts of the building which represented the arms of the cross had been removed some years previously, and the remainder was now furnished with a new roof, and otherwise repaired. Soon afterwards, the more important step was taken of procuring the services of an assistant to Mr. Alexander in the discharge of his pastoral duties; but before proceeding to this part of my narrative, I may as well give here the few remaining incidents in the life of my venerable friend, the fifth minister of Cairncastle. On resigning the active duties of the ministry, Mr. Alexander removed into the town of Larne, with his wife and family, where he and they for some time taught a school, and sat on Sundays under my youthful ministry. On June 25, 1841, a deputation from the Congregation of Cairncastle, consisting of John Gibson, John Tweed, Samuel Richards, and Samuel Hunter, attended a meeting of the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick, and presented to Mr. Alexander a purse of forty sovereigns and a highly-finished time-piece, with an appropriate inscription, "in testimony of his private and public worth, during a ministry of forty-seven years." On this occasion, at the request of the deputation, Mr. Alexander's co-Presbyter and intimate

friend, Rev. Mr. Glendy, of Ballycarry, delivered an admirable address, to which Mr. Alexander made a touching reply. (See *Bible Christian*, xii. 289.) Not long afterwards, Mr. Alexander, accompanied by his family, including the Misses Shaw, of Ballygally, removed to London, where he died May 26, 1851, aged eighty-one years, and was interred in Bunhill Fields—a spot how different from the romantic scene of his earlier and happier days! Beside him, in the course of a few years, were laid the mortal remains of his widow, Mrs. Alexander, who also died in London, August 5, 1858, aged eighty-four years. Both lie far away from Cairncastle and Ballygally! *

VI.—James Mulligan (1833 to 1836) was the sixth minister of Cairncastle, if that title is to be given to an assistant who never enjoyed the honours of the sole pastorate. Mr. Mulligan, who is the son, and now the successor, of the late Rev. Mr. Mulligan, of Moira, was ordained in Cairncastle on Tuesday, December 17, 1833, being the first ordination which took place in the

* During the earlier part of his ministry in Cairncastle, Mr. Alexander lived at Tarnamoney, near the meeting-house, where he long afterwards held a small farm. On his marriage to the daughter of Mr. Lewson, who was also the widow of Mr. Shaw, of Ballygally, he removed to Weyburn, which had, for many years, been the residence of his predecessor and father-in-law. Here he built a large house, which, on his leaving Cairncastle, was, with the adjoining farm, bought by the late Mr. Campbell Wilson, and both are now occupied by my friend, Mr. John Tweed. Mr. and Mrs. Alexander had five sons and one daughter, viz.:—(1) John (deceased); (2) Robert (deceased); (3) Thomas, now living in Iowa, with five children; (4) Lewson, now living in Belgium, with five children; (5) Henry, now living in Newry; and (6) Jane, now living in London. I am not aware that Mr. Alexander ever published anything, nor was he ever, I believe, Moderator of Synod, although, in 1826, he was nominated by his Presbytery for that office. But his tastes were eminently literary, and his judgment in such matters was elegant and fastidious. His voice, in preaching, as, indeed, also in singing, was singularly sweet and musical; and his remarkably tall person must have made his appearance in the pulpit, when he was in his prime, very imposing. Before I knew him he was on the retired list, but he occasionally did me the favour of officiating for me in Larne, and I always felt that "his locks adorned the venerable place." His hoary locks, which were then white as snow, and his voice, which was tremulous with age, well supplied the place of the commanding figure and attractive accents of his youth. My father, whose opinion in such cases was commonly thought to be a good one, always spoke in the most favourable terms of Mr. Alexander's pulpit performances.

Remonstrant body. On this occasion, the Rev. R. Campbell, of Templepatrick, preached from 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4; Rev. W. Glendy, of Ballycarry, explained and defended Presbyterian ordination, and also concluded the services of the day by an appropriate address to the newly-ordained minister and his flock. In the evening, the Presbytery and other attending ministers were entertained at dinner, at which were also present "many persons of respectability from all the other religious denominations of the neighbourhood, exemplifying the Christian liberality which has always prevailed in that part of the country." (See *Bible Christian*, iv., 573.) During his too short ministry in Cairncastle, Mr. Mulligan did all that the most painstaking, conscientious, and conciliating minister could do to heal the serious breaches that had been made in this ancient congregation; but his removal to Moira at the end of 1836, to succeed his father, nipped his efforts in the bud, and Cairncastle has never recovered from his loss.*

VII.—On October 10, 1837, James M'Dowell, a native of the parish of Raloo, was ordained by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the office of assistant minister in Cairncastle, which was rendered vacant by the resignation of Mr. Mulligan. (See *Bible Christian*, viii., 358.) But Mr. M'Dowell's stay in this Congregation was even shorter than had been that of his predecessor, for, in the year 1839, he resigned Cairncastle to take charge of the Congregation of Summerhill, in County Meath.

VIII.—The Cairncastle pulpit, thus again vacated, was speedily filled by the appointment thereto of Robert

* Although Mr. Mulligan's short stay in Cairncastle did not enable him to secure the stability of the Congregation, yet it was long enough to allow him to provide for his own permanent happiness, by affording me the opportunity and privilege, before he left this neighbourhood, of joining him in marriage to his present wife, who was formerly Miss Mary M'Culloch, and who is a great-granddaughter of the Rev. W. Taylor, the third minister of Cairncastle. The splendid collegiate career of my two friends' only child, William John Mulligan, and the high position which that young gentleman now occupies in India, reflect credit on the district where his mother's family has, for many generations, held a respectable rank.

Hall, son of Rev. John Hall, of Clough, County Antrim, who, on December 17, 1839, was ordained by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the office of assistant minister in the Congregation of Cairncastle, and, as Mr. Hall has survived Mr. Alexander, he is now sole minister of this ancient, and, at one time, most respectable and influential Congregation.

I am happy to add, that the meeting-house of Cairncastle is at present in a very creditable condition. Four years ago, it was thorough-drained, re-seated, as well as otherwise much improved; and on August 25, 1861, it was re-opened for public worship, after these repairs, by Rev. H. Alexander, of Newry—the son and grandson of former ministers of Cairncastle. I regret to say that, in the course of executing the repairs above alluded to, the old pulpit in which Patrick Adair had stood more than 200 years ago, went to pieces, and was replaced by a new one in the modern platform style. The meeting-house stands on an English acre of ground, which is well enclosed by a substantial ditch. It is also sheltered on three sides by a belt of thriving trees, which were planted during the ministry of Mr. Mulligan, and are now an ornament to the neighbourhood, as well as a protection to the house. No traces remain of the old session-house, which formerly stood near the site of the present National School-house. This latter building is erected on one corner of the meeting-house property, and at the opposite corner stands the masonic lodge-room, to which I have already referred. Within the meeting-house green is one grave, marked by a neat headstone, with the following inscription:—"Erected by Rev. R. Hall, to the memory of his beloved daughter, Eliza Jane, who died 1st October, 1855, aged 13 years." In this inscription, as in the case of Mr. Compton's, of Raloo, there is a mistake as to the date of death. It certainly ought to be 1853.

As to *Congregational Records* in Cairncastle, I have not been able to hear of any, although I have made repeated inquiries on the subject.

The *funds* are also limited, consisting entirely of two legacies to the minister and schoolmaster for the time being, bequeathed by the late James Wilson, of Bally-

gally, as described at the Visitation which was held in Cairncastle, August 1, 1826 (which see). I have heard that the late Robert Neill, of Ballywillan, also left in his will a legacy of £3 per annum to the minister of this Congregation; but, owing to a legal informality in that document, the generous intention of the testator has not been carried out.

In addition to the foregoing facts with respect to the Congregation and Ministers of Cairncastle, I may mention that this parish has, for many years, been singularly fortunate in having the services of a long series of admirable schoolmasters. John Knox's maxim of placing the school-house beside the Kirk has, indeed, been here remarkably justified. Towards the close of the 17th century, Messrs. May and Patrick Plunkett (the latter traditionally stated to be the ancestor of the present Lord Plunkett) taught school in this parish, and also acted as tutors in the family of the Shaws of Ballygally. In the same double capacity afterwards officiated the celebrated David Manson, who was born in Cairncastle, in 1726, and who, for many years, taught the youth of his native vale in a mud edifice, before he introduced an improved system of education into the towns of Larne, Belfast, and Liverpool successively. In many places, "Manson's Spelling-Book" still holds its ground against all competitors. Subsequently to David Manson flourished, as pedagogues in Cairncastle, John Magill, who taught school at the Roadside, near Lisnahay; Rev. R. Acheson, who taught school at the meeting-house, and was afterwards minister of Glenarm and Fourth Belfast successively; Rev. John Murphy, who was afterwards minister of Islandmagee, where he died;* James Magill, who taught school at the Bogtown; and the Rev. D. Whyte, who, for a time, wielded the ferule in Cairncastle, and after-

* Mr. Murphy's father, Matthew Murphy, was, I believe, a native of Cairncastle. He was, I have been told, the eldest of seven sons; but displeasing his parents by his marriage, he left home in early life, and taught school in various places, amongst others at Newtownlimavady, in the County of Derry. Here his son, the future minister of Islandmagee, appears to have been born; and this circumstance accounts for an expression which that minister was frequently in the habit of using, and which I cannot deny myself the pleasure of cordially repeating—"Of all the places in Ireland, my heart warms to Newtownlimavady."

wards became minister of Ballee, County Down, which office he still fills.

With these educational advantages, it is no wonder that a considerable number of ministers have issued from the Parish of Cairncastle, which, in this respect, presents a striking contrast to its sister Parish of Kilwaughter. The following list of such ministers is as complete as I have been able to make it:—

Samuel Crawford, Ballygilbert, formerly minister of Caw Lane, Leeds, now living—retired.

Joseph Shaw, Ballyhackett, minister of Portglenone and Second Larne, successively—deceased.

Joseph M'Kee, minister of Killead—deceased.

Hugh Hamilton, Corkermain, minister of Cullybackey —still living.

Joseph Logan, Weyburn, minister of Warrenpoint and Dundalk successively—still living.

Henry Alexander, son of Rev. T. Alexander, minister of Lancaster and Newry successively—still living.

Thomas Hunter, formerly a minister in England—still living.

And now, having said all that I have to say about Cairncastle—perhaps my readers may think that I have said too much—I take my leave of that most picturesque and romantic parish, to which, I confess, I am very much attached, in the first two lines of an old Cairncastle song, which was written by a Cairncastle man (Squire Crowe) in the earlier part of the ministry of Rev. T. Alexander, whose name appears therein in its Scotch form, "M'Alshander:"—

> "Bless the parish, say I, where M'Alshander prays,
> The land that's surrounded by sweet Sallagh braes."

CLASSON PORTER.

LARNE, *November 15*, 1865.

THE GOSPEL IN THE CROSS OF CHRIST.

THE three great sources of religious knowledge and spiritual strength which we have in Christianity are found in the life, in the words, and in the death of Christ. If we were asked to which of these three revelations of God's

will the Christian world looks with the highest reverence and the deepest feeling, we should say—speaking for all sects and denominations—to the death of Christ. In the history of any one for whom our interest has been awakened, we turn eagerly to the last days, the last hours of his life, anxious to know how he met that trying scene in the soul's history—what were his latest acts, and what his dying words. Still more with one so remarkable as our Lord—one who stands out from the mass of mankind, and higher far than the most illustrious and most excellent of the children of humanity—one whose life is perfect, whose mission is special and divine—one whose words are laden with the most precious wisdom, fragrant with the odour of Heaven—one who lived for the instruction, guidance, and salvation of the world—one whose life, through ages of darkness and superstition, and not less in times of highest intellectual culture, has been the great exemplar of the best of our race—one whose words of wisdom and purity no increasing knowledge has eclipsed—how did he die?—and in his death how does he benefit and bless his disciples?

Let us contemplate Jesus dying. Death, though coming to him early, did not come suddenly or unexpectedly. He seemed clearly to foresee it, and to understand its near approach; and his last hours of peaceful intercourse with his disciples are remarkable for the words of comfort which he uttered to fortify their souls, and prepare them not only for his removal, but also for the solemn responsibilities that awaited them; and they are remarkable, too, for the earnest and touching prayers which he offered up for his people—the yearnings of a soul overflowing with love and compassion for the world. When he felt that his apprehension was at hand and the first scene of the terrible tragedy was opening, he passed out of the city with his disciples into the silence and seclusion of a garden on the slope of the hill of Olives, and there, withdrawing a little from the others, he bent down in prayer, kneeling first and then falling prostrate on the earth; and in earnest supplication he besought his Father that, if possible, this cup—this impending agony and death—might pass away from him; yet, clinging trustingly and submissively to God, he adds—"Not as I

will, but as Thou wilt." Soon after he is seized by the servants of those who had conspired to destroy him. In that hour of darkness and confusion mark how calm and self-possessed he is, how considerate towards others, how regardless of himself. Over the scene in the palace of Pilate, and in the court of Herod we need not dwell; judgment is speedily pronounced against him, and he is condemned to be crucified. He is hurried through the city to a hill beyond the walls, called Golgotha or Calvary. Tottering under the weight of the cross, he sinks down wearied and faint. At length, the excited multitude and their heartless rulers have reached the destined spot. Crucifixion is an ingenious contrivance not simply to destroy life, but to inflict on the victim intense and protracted torture. The vital portions of the body are untouched; only on the extremities injury is inflicted, and in feverish agony the sufferer may linger on for many hours, death coming too slowly to release him. First the soldiers fastened our Lord to the transverse beam by driving nails through his outstretched hands into the wood; and, as they thus fixed him to the cross, the only words that seem to have passed from his lips were a prayer for his murderers:—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." As he hung on the cross, and the multitude, with that morbid curiosity which draws them to scenes so saddening and painful, stood around, occasional brief ejaculations were uttered by him—"I thirst;" "Son, behold thy mother;" "Mother, behold thy son," thus touchingly committing his mother to his most trusted disciple; "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," thus comforting the dying one beside him; "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit;" "It is finished;" and presently his eyes were closed in death.

Let us stand, in imagination, on that hill, while wicked hands are putting the holy one to death, and hear the blessed lessons which, through shrouded heavens and the maddened cries of the excited populace, are conveyed to our hearts; or, rather, standing where we are, down so many centuries in the stream of time, let us look back to that momentous event, and see what influences it has wrought on the human heart, and on the world.

There, in the approach of death, we see unfaltering trust in God and in his protection. How confidently he speaks of his Father, of the heavenly world, of God's presence, and of the life after death. Entirely free from the undue excitement and fanaticism which sometimes, in seasons of danger, possess the human mind; and free, too, from one despairing thought, he is sustained by implicit trust, speaking to God as though he saw Him, reposing in Him as though he felt an omnipotent arm holding him up, and in his last moments, when life was fast ebbing away, committing himself into his Father's hands.

Are we told that a similar trust has often upheld the dying, and brightened their last hours? Thank God that it is so; and the records of all churches present to us instances of Christian faith and trust that are at once instructive and encouraging. But whence this Christian trust? Does it spring from the progress of knowledge, the sympathy of friends, or the power of wealth? No; but it is, as we believe, the result of Christ's doctrine, and especially of Christ's death. That death seemed to unlock a spring of holy trust, from which have flowed perpetual streams to refresh and sustain those who seek them.

We see in Christ's death, entire submission to his Father's will. We must not confound submission with indifference or callousness. The Romans, under a system of philosophical training, acquired a stoicism which, in cool self-possession, met all trials and braved all dangers; but no such philosophy held the mind of Christ; his leading thought was "God, his Father;" and to Him he desired, in all things, to submit. He lived to do His will, and he died to bear it. There was no callousness; his soul was sensitively alive to pain and sorrow. He shrank from the appalling scene that rose before him—the cross, its ignominy, and its torture; as is evident from the cry of agonised entreaty—"O Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!"—if possible, if consistent with the beneficent purposes for which I was sent,—"but, nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." How entirely he rested in his Father; he knew his love; he knew how from the darkest scenes he could bring light;

therefore he boldly followed where he called, and submitted to all sorrows and sufferings, if it was his will.

Are we told that many in the saddest trials have manifested submission to God, and while they would gladly have clung to life, or have kept the loved ones that God had given them, yet have bowed in submission to Him, and, through tears and agonies, have looked to Him and said, "Thy will be done." True, such illustrations of Christian submission there are to place against prevailing doubt and unbelief; but whence came that trusting and submissive spirit? We reply—from the word, and still more from the death of Christ. This heavenly grace, beaming on the soul of our Lord, has reflected its radiance into the hearts of his faithful followers, and helped them, in a spirit of holy resignation, to commit themselves to their Father in Heaven.

The cross of Christ exhibits the most striking exemplification of love. To pass over the consideration which he manifested for others,—as for his mother, for the dying criminal, for the sorrowing Jewish women, and for the disciples,—we point to that prayer for his murderers, the most touching, sublime, and heavenly that ever was breathed from mortal lips—striking illustration of the meaning and practicability of our Lord's commandment, "Love your enemies." How far that wondrous intercession may have reached and penetrated the hearts of those in whose behalf it was uttered, we cannot tell. Some, struck, captivated, melted by it, may have embraced the Gospel of him whom they had murdered; but how mighty its influence has since been to soften enmity, to kindle charity, and, in a world of strife and bitterness, to promote a spirit of forbearance and forgiveness!

In the cross of Christ we see his love for the world. That love is displayed in the errand of mercy and salvation on which he came; but it is most remarkably illustrated in his death. *He gave himself for us.* This truth is repeated frequently, and in various forms, in the sacred Scriptures. We know that the most touching expression of love is suffering. Words do not necessarily express love—they may be the language of falsehood—at any rate they cost nothing. Labour endured for others expresses true love; thus, the parent toils for his children,

the patriot for his country, and the philanthropist for his kind; but more powerfully does suffering speak. See how the disinterested love of a mother shines, in cheerfully enduring pain and danger for her offspring; that of the patriot, in leaving home and ease, throwing himself into the front of the battle, and imperilling his life in his country's cause; and that of the philanthropist, in exposing himself to disease and death in efforts to lessen the miseries or enlarge the liberties of his fellow-men. And so in Christ's death, endured for a sinful world, we see most remarkably exhibited, his love, deep, disinterested, and abiding. He died for us, he gave himself a sacrifice for us, that he might save us from our sins, might redeem us from iniquity, might reconcile us to God. The purpose of Christ's death, so far as we can understand it, is to reconcile us to God, to move us to repentance, to save us from our sins, to lead us to holiness, to bring us to heaven. These ideas are variously expressed, and sometimes in strongly figurative language, plainly intelligible to the Jew but often perplexing to others. In the Jewish religion there were many sacrifices and offerings, as sin-offerings and thank-offerings, and the pious Jew showed his earnest devotion by giving to God of his possessions—his oil or his wine, a lamb from the flock or a beast from the herd. Christ gave *himself*, his own life, to redeem us from iniquity; and thus the Jew, when he became a Christian, would gratefully declare that he had "redemption through his blood," and that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." The meaning of such terms to Gentiles would be, that, through Christ and his death, we are moved to repentance, and thus have forgiveness. Other portions of the Jewish ritual service are employed to represent Christ and his work. He is called "the mercy-seat," and "the high priest." The holiest terms in their religion are used to exhibit, in the strongest language, the work of Christ; but, through all, only one redemption is indicated, that which is through repentance and newness of life.

With the death of Christ we necessarily connect his resurrection. God raised him from the dead; and through one who died and lived again for a time on

earth, and is now in heaven, we humbly hope for redemption from the grave, and for "an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that passeth not away." Had Christ been revealed to us, and had he taught us, and then passed mysteriously to the spirit-land, how much of the power of the Gospel we would have lost, and how much we would still need light to guide us through the dark valley!

See, then, the Gospel in the cross of Christ, in the trust, the submission, and the charity which it reveals,—the love of Christ and of God for the world,—the redemption it offers, and the light which, through the resurrection, it throws into the tomb. Apart from all that superstition has taught about God inflicting on Christ the torments and agonies that else all the world should have suffered in hell for ever, and about God, our loving Father, rejoicing in bloodshed; and apart, too, from all that scepticism has taught about Christ being no Christ, but only a pious Jew, who, for some political offence, was put to death, and about Christians placing all their faith in a man murdered for them, sentiments which have, under the specious plea of religious liberty, been broached in professedly Christian pulpits, there come to us from the cross of our Lord, strength, comfort, pardon, heaven. Let us bless God for him who died for us.

ONE BY ONE.

One by one the sands are flowing,
One by one the moments fall;
Some are coming, some are going,—
Do not strive to grasp them all.

One by one thy duties wait thee,
Let thy whole strength go to each;
Let no future dreams elate thee,
Learn thou first what these can teach.

One by one bright gifts from Heaven,
Joys are sent thee here below;
Take them readily when given,
Ready, too, to let them go.

One by one thy griefs shall meet thee:
Do not fear an armed band;
One will fade as others reach thee,
Shadows passing through the land.

Do not look at life's long sorrow,
See how small each moment's pain;
God will help thee for to-morrow,
Every day begin again.

Every hour that fleets so slowly,
Has its task to do, or bear;
Luminous the crown, and holy,
If thou set each gem with care.

Do not linger with regretting,
Or for passing hours despond;
Nor, the daily toil forgetting,
Look too eagerly beyond.

Hours are golden links, God's token
Reaching Heaven; but one by one
Take them, lest the chain be broken
Ere the pilgrimage be done.

A. A. Proctor.

REV. J. MARTINEAU'S REPLY TO "A CHALLENGE ACCEPTED."

In *The Inquirer* of August 12th, I ventured to ask Mr. Panton Ham the following question:—"Where, and by whom, the doctrine imputed by him had been maintained, that Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church," and "term of Christian fellowship?"

In the November number of *The Christian Unitarian* Mr. John Scott Porter professes to answer this question by six citations, all of them, with one exception, reproduced from the recent controversies in the Antrim Presbytery and the Remonstrant Synod. It is very natural that he should appeal to local examples, fresh in his recollection; nor is there anything in the mere wording

of my question to preclude the appeal. At the same time, my inquiry was evidently meant to have no wider range than Mr. Ham's own statements, of which it sought the explanation: and so absolutely were these confined to our English discussions, that, as it turned out, they did not even travel beyond the Editor of *The Inquirer*. I certainly never thought of making either Mr. Ham or myself responsible for the polemic utterances of a church other than our own, during a period of practical conflict and litigation, little favourable to calm judgment and measured expression. Nevertheless, in the hope of clearing away mistakes, hurtful alike to piety and to charity, I will say a few words on Mr. Porter's witnesses.

I must beg, however, to strike out from the list the mere reports of conversations, unacknowledged by the speakers; and shall confine myself to the cases of published opinion to which a definite responsibility attaches. Three out of the four witnesses—viz., Mr. Maginnis, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. J. Porter—are so essentially concurrent that they may treated together.

What opinion are they adduced as maintaining? That "the proper basis of THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH (universally) is 'Free Inquiry' or 'Religious Liberty'; so that the ends of Christian fellowship are perfectly satisfied by any association of people, however hetrogeneous in faith and in feeling, who agree to let each other's religion alone."

What opinion does Mr. John Scott Porter's cross-examination extract from these witnesses? That 'Free Inquiry,' or 'Religious Liberty,' is the *distinctive* 'principle," or "bond," or "groundwork" of—what? The Christian Church? No, but of the *Presbytery of Antrim*, or the *Remonstrant Synod*—bodies which are not even churches at all, but ecclesiastical assemblies, pre-supposing the existence and religious life of separate congregations. A writer who wants to explain the characteristic difference between his own religious body and an older one from which it parts, has no occasion to speak of the spiritual features common to both—Christian worship and consecration to the Christian life. Common sense and candour will credit him with these; and he has only to name the specialty, whatever it be, which he adds on

or takes off from his neighbour's method of seeking these great ends. Accordingly, each of Mr. John Scott Porter's witnesses simply means to say—"What unites us to each other, and parts us from you, is the resolve to carry on the mission of the Christian Church without taking verbal securities for the requisite amount of intellectual agreement."

To represent this as a *substitution* of mental freedom for Christian ends, instead of a pursuit of Christian ends *under the condition* of freedom, is an error so extraordinary, that, except in the field of theological controversy, no clear-minded man could fall into it.

It remains for me only to notice the citation from Mr. Jeffery Worthington's address on occasion of his settlement service at Bolton. He characterised the "Church of Christ," it is said, as "that living church, unfettered by creed, by tie, or by anything,—a church which holds as its members the good and the true of all ages."

I find it here stated that "the Christian Church," in discharging its mission, needs no verbal fetters of inflexible definition; but I do *not* find it stated that, in dispensing with these fetters, and simply gathering together people who have nothing in common but "free inquiry," its mission is accomplished. On the contrary, I find quite another principle of union suggested—the union of "the good and the true"—a bond of inward Righteousness and Fidelity. Mr. Worthington's sentiment therefore I take to be simply this, that those who unite, as Christians must, in devoted service to God and man, need not predetermine the measure of their doctrinal agreement, but may trust to their paramount object to find it adequately for them. Is Mr. John Scott Porter offended by the catholicity of Mr. Worthington's claim for the church, that "the good and the true *of every age*" shall be numbered into it? I cannot say whether the expression was intended to include the præ-Christian ages; but even if it were, it only repeats the doctrine of Justin Martyr, that the same divine Logos which was entire in Christ, dwelt partially in all who had ever lived or taught aright, so that they are to be counted as Christians, even though, like Socrates and Heracleitus, treated as godless by their contemporaries.—*Apol.* i. 46.

In no one of these instances, then, is there any avowal of the principle which Mr. John Scott Porter and Mr. Ham rightly regard as absurd, but wrongly attribute to those who differ from them. My learned and accomplished critic only gives me fresh reason to say that "I have often seen this opinion imputed, but never seen it maintained." It is one of those miserable fictions of controversy which keeps living men from mutual understanding and approach, though with essentially the same thought in their mind and prayer at their heart. The question whether the theological agreement requisite for church life had better be secured by definition, or left unsecured, except by the play of natural sympathy, is a fair question, open to reasonable discussion; but the attempt, from whatever side it comes, to influence the decision by drawing fancy-pictures of the alternative conclusions, is worthy neither of a grave cause nor of a Christian advocate.

JAMES MARTINEAU.

LONDON, *November* 12, 1865.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES ON EXCLUSIVES AND INCLUSIVES.

SIR,—On considering my queries that you printed in your last number, in connexion with what has been written since, the following additional queries have suggested themselves as of considerable importance in this controversy:—

Premising that, according to *The Inquirer* of September 30th, Unitarians are to have a bond of fellowship "deeper than an opinion," and further, that this "creed, which they should by all means have as the basis of their Association," is a predominant belief as the acknowledged ground of their religious fellowship, and this *predominant* belief is that the "pure in heart are the blest of God," in all times, and under all circumstances, I would ask, if puremindedness is to be the bond of admission, must not *impurity* of mind exclude, and must there not be exclusion after all? Is this purity to be absolute or relative? Is there any person existing that could be pronounced absolutely "pure in heart," and what is to be the standard of comparison among those that are relatively so? Who is to be the judge? What is to be the criterion? How is this purity of heart, which is blest of God in all times and under all circumstances, and which is to be the ground of fellowship, "both in form and theory," to be ascertained? Is there to be a confessional? Is each person proposing to be admitted to be catechised, and by whom? By whom is this prerogative of searching

the thoughts of the heart to be exercised? By the minister? Will any congregation allow this? This would be worse than "fencing the tables" in the Scotch Church. Is it by a committee? and would such a tribunal be tolerated? Is it the doctrine of the Acts and Epistles that every member of a Christian Church was pure in heart, or, I should rather say, that they must be pure in heart before they were admitted? Will the British and Foreign Unitarian Association proclaim, "in plain language," without "ambiguous and ill-defined phrases," that purity of heart, both in "form and theory," is their distinguishing principle by which they are to be known from all Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Trinitarians, Calvinists, and so forth? Will the British and Foreign endorse W. C. Coupland's definition of a Church, in his Discourse at Bridgewater, as being "a community of joyous wayfarers who worship the Ideal under no form or all forms,—whose bond of union is a common sigh after everlasting perfectness,—whose indispensable acknowledgment must be unconditional liberty, with no intellectual bounds, renouncing every creed, the condition of membership being solely a confession of social and individual imperfection?" Verily Mr. Coupland has got the start of *The Inquirer* in his advance. *The Inquirer* calls this "an Utopian consummation." Does he mean that it is the imaginary perfection of a Christian Church, as Sir Thomas More's Utopia was the imaginary perfection of a political commonwealth?—Yours, &c.,

QUERIST.

THE PORTER AND BAGOT DISCUSSION.

DEAN BAGOT, writing to *The Record* in reference to the discussion carried on between him and the Rev. J. Scott Porter, in 1834, says:—

"The most important practical results have followed from it, as all persons acquainted with Belfast and the North of Ireland can testify. If it did no more than constrain many concealed Unitarians to avow themselves as such, it would have, in this respect, done good. But it has done much more. There are not now half the number of professing Unitarians in the North of Ireland that there were at the time of the discussion. Numbers have, from time to time, since 1834, left Unitarian congregations and joined either the Church of England or orthodox Presbyterian churches. There is also a doctrine much nearer to orthodox Christianity preached in Unitarian meeting-houses than formerly. In fact, the creed of Irish Unitarians has approached as nearly as possible to Catholic truth; and my conviction is, that there is now no such thing as professed Socinianism in this country. I know it to be a fact that the Belfast discussion has tended very much to bring about this result."

We agree with the Dean in thinking that the discussion led, in various cases, to practical results. We have been told that some, in consequence of it, embraced the Trinitarian doctrine; and we also know that some were by it led to embrace Unitarian views. We happened in the course of the past autumn to meet with a gentleman whom Mr. Porter's arguments brought over to Unitarianism, and who is now an active member of a flourishing Unitarian

congregation in Montreal, established subsequently to 1834. This is just what we might have expected from a controversy carried on on both sides with acknowledged ability—each won some adherents to his cause. The Dean, however, is entirely under a wrong impression respecting the condition of Unitarianism in Belfast and Ulster since the date of the discussion. We do not believe that many were, through the discussion, induced to avow Unitarian opinions which, till then, they had concealed. If there were such avowals, they would help, and not injure, the Unitarian cause; but we are disposed to think that no such result followed; and we believe that there are at the present moment in Trinitarian churches, and especially in the Established Church, many whose opinions are essentially Unitarian, and that the number has of late been largely increased. It is, at the same time, a melancholy fact that, prior to the discussion and since, many, as they have grown rich and, through "the deceitfulness of riches," have become indifferent to religious principles, have passed over from the Unitarian, as from other Dissenting churches, to the Establishment. It is now a rare thing for a wealthy family to remain true to Dissenting principles beyond a single generation. Such is the power of *fashion*. But, on the other hand, instances occur from time to time of persons withdrawing from the Established Church, and joining one which, though less fashionable, is, in our mind, more scriptural. It is evident that Dean Bagot has known little of the agitation that has prevailed among the Unitarians of Ulster during the past several years, else he could not say that there is a doctrine much nearer to orthodox Christianity preached in Unitarian meeting-houses now than formerly. The fact is, that whatever change has taken place has been in *the other direction*, and in one Belfast pulpit extreme views were preached within the last few years, which, in 1834, no Unitarian congregation would have tolerated. We shall not question the correctness of the Dean when he says that the creed of Irish Unitarians approaches as nearly as possible to Catholic truth, if by Catholic he means scriptural; but thank him for the favourable opinion he expresses of our theology. Neither shall we differ from him when he says there is no such thing as Socinianism in this country. There neither is now, nor, so far as we know, was there, such a doctrine professed or entertained in Ulster; but if, as we suspect, by Socinianism he means Humanitarianism, he is greatly in error. In one at least of the Belfast congregations—perhaps in two—Humanitarianism is the predominating view, and is certainly more largely held than it was in 1834.

INTELLIGENCE.

OPENING OF THE CONIGREE NEW SCHOOL-ROOMS, TROWBRIDGE.

The school-rooms recently erected in connexion with the Conigree Chapel, Trowbridge, Wilts, were opened on Sunday, October 29.

The style of building is the decorated, in keeping with that of the chapel. The dimensions of the school are 38 feet by 39. It is built of freestone and brick, and is lighted by four windows, which are bordered with coloured glass. The roof is ribbed with stained deal, and the benches of the same material. The principal feature which strikes the visitor are the numerous coloured Scriptural illustrations framed and glazed, which, with large type passages of Scripture and hymns, adorn the walls in profusion, giving the interior of the building a cheerful aspect, so different from the dull and dismal appearance which characterised the old-fashioned school-rooms. Conspicuous in this respect are some ten or twelve suitable Scriptural mottoes over the doors and windows, all painted in old English characters, with illuminated capitals, on zinc, to imitate scrolls. These are all the work of the esteemed pastor's own hands. In the morning, the Rev. S. Martin preached from 1 Chron. xxix. 5—"Who is willing to consecrate his services this day unto the Lord." In the afternoon a Dedication service was held in the school-room, at three o'clock, at which 400 persons, including the children, and many visitors, were present. After singing, prayer, and the reading of a portion of Scripture, Mr. Martin delivered a suitable address to the teachers and children. The teachers were engaged in a holy and blessed work, which angels might be glad to perform. They were training the children up for God, that they might be blessings to their teachers, their parents, their friends, and society at large, and that they might shine as stars in heaven hereafter. Sunday-school teaching was a most glorious and important work, and the two ruling principles which should govern the teacher should be—1st, Love to the Saviour; 2nd, Love to the child. He thanked God they had such convenient school-rooms, and so many friends around them to help them in the good work. He enjoined upon the teachers to be sure to carry out their work to the utmost of their abilities, and never faint nor tire in it. He also enjoined upon the scholars the necessity of avoiding evil companions, and of being punctual at school. There were three things necessary to make a scholar—brains, books, and application. They all had brains; there were plenty of books in the school; but the application must be given by the children themselves.

In the evening, the Rev. John Marten, of Saffron Walden, preached from 1 Tim. i. 15—"Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." The collections of the day amounted to more than £20.

The tea-meeting was held in the school-room, on Monday evening, and nearly 350 persons sat down. After tea a public meeting was held in the chapel (which was adorned with numerous vases of beautiful flowers), under the able presidency of B. Adames, Esq., J.P., of Chichester. The meeting was addressed by the Revs. S. Martin, J. Marten, J. C. Means, F. R. Young, and Messrs. J. R. Mott, J. Hawkins, J. Smith, —— Dyer, and D. Shaw. A resolution expressing sympathy with Mr. Martin, and acknowledging his valuable labours in Trowbridge, was moved by Mr. Means, and, being seconded, was put and carried by a forest of hands, and amidst much applause. A cordial vote of thanks was passed to the

chairman, and the proceedings were closed with the Evening Hymn and Benediction.

INSTALLATION OF THE REV. J. A. CROZIER AT NEWRY.

On Tuesday, November 7, the Remonstrant Presbytery of Armagh met in the Needham Place Church, Newry, to instal the Rev. John Armstrong Crozier, recently of Ballymena, as assistant minister of the Remonstrant Congregation of that place. After the usual devotional services, the Rev. Samuel Ferguson preached an eloquent sermon from "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." The Rev. Samuel Moore next, in an able address, explained and defended Presbyterian ordination, and, after proposing to the minister-elect the usual questions, which were answered in the affirmative, he called on him to make any statement he might desire of his views of Christian doctrine and of the ministerial work.

Mr. CROZIER, availing himself of the opportunity thus afforded, stated that he had had occasion to preach during the Sundays of the last two months before the Newry Congregation, and had administered the communion to them, and it was but reasonable to expect that they would know in that time what were his leading theological views. Still he had no hesitation in stating that in all religious questions his views were similar to those which had been so eloquently expressed in the writings of the great Dr. Channing, and put forth by the leaders of their own communion at home, such as Bruce, Armstrong, Montgomery, Porter, Mitchell, and Alexander. He regarded the Father as the only true object of worship, and acknowledged that next in dignity was his Son, the Lord and Saviour of the world. He believed the Holy Spirit as the power and influence of the Father himself, working spiritually to regenerate and sanctify the minds and hearts of His children. Regarding man's duty, he held it incumbent upon us not to show other than a living faith which worketh by love, the spirit of charity, of peace, and good will to all mankind.

Mr. MOORE continued to say that he felt persuaded that their rev. brother would give himself to the work of the ministry amongst his people with all the ability with which the Lord should bless him, and all the diligence which the importance and responsibility of the office demands, and faithfully labour to extend to others the principles of their holy religion; that he would duly administer the ordinances of the Gospel, visit regularly his people, duly instruct the young, administer in the house of mourning consolation, and carefully strive to perform any other duty which a sense of his own responsibility and the condition of his people might seem to require.

The Rev. WILLIAM CROZIER then ascended the pulpit, and delivered a charge to the minister and congregation, in the course of which he quoted appropriate passages from the 4th chapter of Paul's 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, and took occasion to enlarge upon the character that the minister of the Gospel ought to maintain for moral integrity, elevation of mind, and superiority to the sordid and corrupting influences of the world. He mentioned some of the

trials of his faith and uprightness which the Christian minister is exposed to in the present day, and pointed out the course which, in such circumstances, he ought to pursue. That he should despise "that fear of man which bringeth a snare," and resolutely follow the dictates of conscience wherever they may lead. That, as the ambassador of Christ, he should disdain all compromise with popular opinion, prejudice, or maxims, worldly fashion, selfish interests, and temporal ambition. That he should be above deceit, single-minded, and sincere, remembering that, like his Divine Master, he is sent "to bear witness to the *truth*," and not shrinking from declaring it whatever it may cost him. Anxious always to keep a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man, to maintain the erect and fearless attitude of virtue, and to manifest in all things that "simplicity and godly sincerity" which should characterize the Christian teacher. Blending thus in his character the heavenly union of truth and virtue, he will commend his preaching by his evangelical example, and "glorify our Father who is in heaven."

Mr. Crozier next addressed the Congregation briefly and in kind terms. He said, a duty devolved on them of great importance, viz., the cheering influence of their zealous and affectionate co-operation with their pastor, their attention to his instruction, and their kindness and candour in their judgment. That they will never shut their eyes to the light of divine truth, nor fear to exercise a calm and earnest inquiry on this most interesting of human researches. That they will not allow themselves to be "carried about by every wind of doctrine," but evince the steadfastness and rectitude of their principles by their purity of life, their integrity and zeal, and their just appreciation and cordial approbation of the honest, the candid, and the sincere, in their upright intentions, their conscientious duties, and their Christian services. Then, with a ministry so evangelical and devoted, and a people so disposed, you have nothing to fear. The soil is then prepared for the sound and uncorrupted seed, and, with the divine blessing, it will grow and flourish, and you will be the honoured instruments in maintaining, as you have hitherto done, under the able and pious men who have ministered to you in holy things, a church for the worship of the one only living and true God the Father, in the pure faith and doctrine of his Son Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and men, and in the happy bond of Christian fellowship, affection, and hope. "And now I fervently commend both pastor and people to God, and to the Word of his grace, which is able to build you up in holiness and comfort, and to give you an inheritance among them that are sanctified. May every spiritual blessing be imparted to you from the Father of lights. May peace and prosperity be within your Zion. May the wings of the Almighty overshadow you. May his Holy Spirit dwell in your hearts and direct your steps through your earthly journey, and fit you for a happy union in the pure and everlasting mansions of heaven."

The Rev. John Montgomery then offered up the installation prayer, and the services were brought to a close.

In the evening, the members of Presbytery were entertained at dinner by the Congregation in the Imperial Hotel,—Hill Irvine,

Esq., J.P., occupied the chair, and Dr. Connor the vice-chair. After dinner, the usual loyal toasts having been duly honoured,

Mr. Walter Scott read the following letter of apology from the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, Dunmurry :—

"Dunmurry Glebe, *Oct.* 31, 1865.

"My Dear Sir,—I beg to assure the Committee of the old Congregation of Newry that I feel much gratified by their invitation to be present at Mr. Crozier's installation on Monday next. I lament, however, that I am still so feeble and so seriously indisposed as entirely to prevent my undertaking the fatigue of a journey and attending your dinner. Under happier circumstances, I should, from many interesting associations, have been gratified to visit Newry ; but I must submit to the penalties of old age with as much equanimity and resignation as I can command, truly thankful to a gracious Providence for the very large amount of blessings conferred upon me, through almost eighty years. Were I even able to avail myself of the invitation which you have so kindly presented, my feelings would be of a very mingled and rather melancholy character. The past would inevitably throw a dark shadow over the present ; for, whilst I should rejoice in the long and unbroken series of eminent and thoroughly "Christian" ministers whom your congregation have had the good sense and good fortune to choose, I could not fail to remember how many of them were my own most valued friends and fellow-labourers.

"Fifty-seven years ago, A. G. Malcolm resigned the pulpit, in which I have ever since officiated, an event which gave a colouring to the whole of my subsequent life, and perhaps in some degree to the history of our little church. He was a man of talent, large attainments, refined tastes, untiring energies, and the most elevated Christian principles. His premature death, from disease caught in the faithful discharge of duty, cast a gloom over our church ; but his memory is still green in the hearts of his surviving friends, and his unobtrusive virtues yet live in his estimable children.

"Most worthily was good Dr. Malcolm succeeded by John Mitchell, 'one of the excellent of the earth,' with whom our long struggles in the Synod of Ulster for religious liberty, brought me into the most confidential and intimate relations. With a singularly clear understanding, he possessed the purest Christian integrity, and an elevated tone of moral sentiment which I have never known surpassed, and perhaps never equalled. As easily might the sun have been turned from his course as John Mitchell from the path of duty. I always felt my own moral constitution refined and invigorated by communion with a man every way so estimable and so pure.

"Of Mr. Alexander I will not say all I think and feel—a man probably superior to any of his predecessors in large grasp, acuteness, and energy of mind. I cannot, however, refrain from expressing my deep regret that, owing to premature infirmity of body, his aptitude and abilities can no longer be actually employed in the service of our small and struggling church—'When best employed and wanted most.' Looking to his predecessors, my worthy 'son-in-law' may well feel anxious as to the comparisons which will be naturally instituted ; but this will, I am sure, only animate him to persevering exertions ; and I pledge myself that the standard of Christian truth will never be lowered in his hands in deference to the mystical and infidel speculation of the age.—With kindest remembrances, I am, with sincere regard, dear sir, your obliged friend,

"H. Montgomery.

"Hill Irvine, Esq."

The Chairman proposed the health of their new minister, the Rev. John A. Crozier.

Mr. Crozier rose to respond. He said—Mr. Chairman, I beg to return my very best thanks for the exceedingly kind and over-flattering manner in which you have proposed, and my kind friends have received, the toast. I was not unprepared, however, for the flattering proofs you have given of your kindness. Perhaps, in some degree I have to thank my father for it, and to place it to my credit as imputed righteousness. Gentlemen, when invited to become the minister of this congregation, I was actuated by mixed motives. I had always been informed that Newry was distinguishd for its kindness to a long succession of eminent and useful ministers. Indeed, I would have been indisposed to accept the invitation, had I not known that a hopeful and devoted minister would be seconded in his endeavours to promote that Gospel which we all hold dear. The rev. gentleman reverted to the status of his predecessor—a status which, though in his opinion much higher than he ever hoped to reach, was yet one that he would keep before him as a model which it would be his constant aim to come up to. He would implore the congregation to bear in mind that it was natural that he should not in all things reach to their ideas of the proper standard. He would, however, with God's help, do his best; and he trusted that the united efforts of pastor and people would effect the spiritual good which Christ designed—that union of faith and good works which alone could afford solid satisfaction in this world, and the hope of obtaining everlasting life in the world which is to come.

The Chairman then gave the Armagh Presbytery, coupling with it the name of the Rev. John Montgomery. The toast was duly honoured and responded to. He then proposed the health of the Rev. Henry Alexander, who for twenty-five years was pastor of the congregation, and who, owing to physical infirmity, was compelled to relinquish his charge.

Mr. Glenny, in the absence of Mr. Alexander, responded. He said that Mr. Alexander had won the good-will of all men. His labours were long and faithful, and his conduct was, in all respects, conformable to what should be expected from a sincere servant of God. It had pleased God to impair his health, but the vigour of his mind and his fidelity and righteousness still, thank God, remained; and he only shared the hope common to all present, that his days would be extended, and his soul refreshed with the news from time to time that, under his successor, the congregation were advancing in all the Christian graces, and becoming more and more like their Lord and Master; and, in conclusion, he would say that, if Mr. Crozier exerted himself with that Christian philanthropy which marked Mr. Alexander—and he had no doubt of it—the Newry congregation would not regret their choice.

The Chairman then gave the health of the Rev. Wm. Crozier, father of the Rev. Mr. Crozier, pastor of the congregation.

Mr. Crozier rose and said—"I thank you Mr. Chairman and gentlemen for the cordial manner my health has been received, which I attribute to my being an *old friend*, as well as the father of your newly-elected minister, and I feel very grateful for your

kindness. My acquaintance with the congregation of Newry is now of long standing. When a very young man, I preached in it one of my earliest discourses, in the time of that eminent man, Dr. Malcolm, of whose kindness I retain a lively recollection. I afterwards became the co-Presbyter of Mr. Mitchell, and enjoyed the brotherly regard and intimacy of that excellent man. Many friends whom I then knew are passed away; but I am happy to meet some old and valued friends, still green and vigorous, and as earnestly devoted to the interests of this worshipping society as in their early days. I am happy also to see them zealously supported by a new generation, who seem determined to uphold the standard of Christian faith and righteousness in this corner of Christ's vineyard, proving (if proof were required) that they have been well and faithfully instructed by your estimable and beloved pastor, whose failing health is so deeply deplored. I trust his successor will possess a similar spirit of zeal and devotedness, and will earnestly endeavour to prove himself worthy of the great and good examples who have preceded him in the ministry of this congregation. I am proud that he has received so unanimous and cordial a welcome amongst you, and I hope and believe you will find him possessed of those good qualities that will increase and secure your favourable regards. I am persuaded that he is heartily devoted to his calling—that he has the ability and the mind to work—and that he will not be found slumbering at his post. And, as to you, the respected members of his flock, I believe you would belie all your former prestige and your well-known characteristics, if he do not find you a willing, kind, and cordial people, who will strengthen his hands, and cheer him on in his path of duty. Permit me to conclude by expressing my earnest desire and hope, that you and he may be united in a mutual spirit and bond of faith, respect, and esteem, and that he may be long spared to promote, by his zealous labours, the permanent interest and prosperity of this Christian congregation."

The CHAIRMAN next gave "the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster," coupling with it the name of Dr. Montgomery. The Rev. J. Montgomery, of Banbridge, responded.

The company separated at an early hour.

STANHOPE STREET DOMESTIC MISSION.

The gratuitous winter evening readings to the attendants and others of the mission services, were commenced on Monday, November 6, by Mr. J. M. Darbishire, to a crowded audience, among whom were many of the elder Sunday scholars and members of the mission choir. Mr. Darbishire gave, with much pathos, and with much humour, as the occasion required, several extracts from Wordsworth, Bloomfield, and Dickens, interspersed with appropriate observations on the characteristics of the writers, and the tendency of what was read to promote reflection, kindness of heart, and good humour in those who listened to him. On the following Monday evening, November 13, the reading desk was occupied by the Rev. T. Bowring, whose subject was, "An Evening with Gold-

smith." He introduced many anecdotes of the life of that improvident man, but pure and graceful writer, and gave extracts from his writings both in prose and verse. The Rev. J. Scott Porter addressed the meeting on Monday evening, November 20. His theme was the "Life of St. Patrick," and it was dilated on with the lecturer's known learning, ability, and clearness. Mr. Bowring, at the close, announced that Mr. W. H. Greer would read on the following Monday evening.

Mr. Bowring would desire very respectfully to remind the friends of the Domestic Mission that the winter season has commenced, and with it many wants of the poor, such as they scarcely heed during the time of summer. There are now pressing demands for cast-off garments of every kind, as well as for coal tickets. Anything sent to his care for those whom he daily meets, and who need the liberal hand of charity, will be thankfully received and carefully distributed. "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord."

Mission House, *November*, 1865.

REMONSTRANT CONGREGATION OF KILLINCHY.

On Sunday, November 12, the Rev. J. T. Whitehead, of Ainsworth, Lancashire, preached in the Remonstrant Meeting-house, Killinchy, and a collection was taken up to aid in defraying expenses incurred in improving the congregational property. The day was fine, and a large number of persons attended, many of them from neighbouring congregations. The preacher took his text from Mark xii. 48, from which he preached an appropriate and impressive sermon. The collection, after sermon, including the proceeds of sale of tickets, and contributions from those who were unable to attend, amounted to the munificent sum of £160.

UNITARIANISM IN CALIFORNIA.

We extract the following notice of the success of the Rev. H. Stebbins, a minister of the Unitarian Church, San Francisco, and of the prospects of our cause in California, from a letter of the Rev. Dr. Bellows, in the *New York Inquirer*:—"We hear but one account—not in the least surprising to those who know him—of Mr. Stebbins's success in California. The church is full of interested and edified worshippers. Mr. Stebbins had appeared before the public in most of the various forms in which Mr. King exerted his talents, as a political or patriotic speaker, a lecturer, an academic orator, as the spokesman of the pioneers—an always honorable office in San Francisco—and, in all, had surpassed the expectations of his friends, gratified their pride, and satisfied their judgment. It is plain that one year has rooted him—as five years hardly roots any citizen or minister here—deeply and firmly in the rich California soil. His influence is high, broad, and noble. His mission—one of the most critical and uncertain in itself ever undertaken—has proved an entire success.

OBITUARY.

Died, on Sept. 15, at Natal, Arthur William Bruce, son of Robert Bruce, Esq., Bristol, in the 25th year of his age.

Died, on October 26, at Sydenham, Belfast, Dawson, youngest son of Mr. Richard Baxter.

Died, suddenly, on November 12th, at Alton, Hampshire, Mrs. Gaskell, Authoress of "Mary Barton" and other popular works, and wife of the Rev. William Gaskell, Senior Minister of Cross Street Chapel, Manchester.

Died, on November 12, at Elm Park, Drumcondra, near Dublin, Thomas Hutton, Esq., D.L., in the 78th year of his age. Throughout a long and honourable career, which has spanned nearly seventy-eight years, he maintained a conspicuous place amongst the first and best citizens. While in politics he was unswerving in his fidelity to the Liberal party, the unbending integrity which characterised his conduct in all the relations of life, whether as employer, magistrate, or municipal representative, rendered the name of Thomas Hutton a synonyme for all that was honourable and benevolent. In his death all classes of the community will lament the departure from amongst them of one whose pure, useful, and straightforward life was a brilliant example and encouragement to all. In his religious, as in his political principles, he was consistent and liberal; he had a personal as well as hereditary attachment to the Congregation of Strand Street, Dublin, under the ministry of Drs. Moody, Armstrong, and Drummond. Since its removal to Stephen's Green he had been unable to attend at its religious services.

Died, on November 15, at Ballystockart, Comber, Miss Margaret Davidson.

Died, on November 18, at Manchester, William M'Cance, Esq., late of Suffolk.

Died, on November 24, at his residence in Merrion Square, Dublin, Edward Hutton, Esq., M.D.; eminent in his profession, highly esteemed as an instructor of Medical Students, liberal in his charities, honourable in all his dealings, regular and earnest in his attendance in Eustace Street Congregation, of which his father, the Rev. Joseph Hutton, was for so many years the respected pastor.

Died, suddenly, on November 25th, at Bedford Square, London, Fanny Ellen, eldest daughter of the Rev. D. Maginnis, of Stourbridge, aged eighteen years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. IV.] JANUARY, 1866. [No. 12.

THE SPIRIT OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

THE Rev. John James Tayler has recently published in consecutive numbers of *The London Inquirer* six letters "On Divisions of Opinion among Unitarians," the object of which is to show that there is a common ground of Christianity on which the differing parties can meet, and that, while there are diverging tendencies, they do not affect essentials. We shall endeavour briefly to exhibit the most prominent thoughts which these letters present; but we would, in the outset, express our high appreciation of the reverent spirit which pervades them, and the entire absence of the wild and reckless statements which have unhappily been too frequent of late in the discussion of Unitarian questions.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Tayler should have spread over so many letters his views and the illustration of them, as, with a little effort at condensation, the substance of the whole might easily have been compressed within a single letter, and views which protracted writing has only tended to dilute, might have been distinctly fixed in the mind of the reader.

The leading idea which Mr. Tayler seeks to establish is, that Christianity is not a dogma, but "the spirit of a life," and that, wherever there is an accordance in the character with the spirit of the life of Christ, there is a Christian. We need hardly stop to show that there is nothing novel in this view of Christianity, and that, where some have sought to bind the church to the teachings of the New Testament, or even to a confession of Jesus as the Christ, others have alleged that Christianity is not a doctrine or a dogma, but a spirit, and have

seemed to think that, although they should laugh at the Evangelists' narratives as fabulous, and ridicule the notion of Jesus being, in any special sense, sent from God, they may yet assume the office of Christian teachers, and undertake to instruct others in the essentials of Christianity. Unhappily those who thus reduce the Gospel to a spirit have too often betrayed, by their bigotry and intolerance, an absence of what they themselves hold to be essential, and have proved that they have neither the doctrines nor the spirit of Christ. We cannot too highly commend the spirit of Christ's life: in one sense we are only Christian in so far as we possess it; in the impressive language of an Apostle—"If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." But surely some at least of the Jews, in our Saviour's time, and of the Gentiles too, had something of the spirit of piety and love which animated our Lord. Shall we, therefore, maintain that such men were Christians? Certainly not; if they lived in our time, and came within the bounds of our denomination, we should not think of ordaining or inducting them as ministers of Christ. We admit that, when the soul of man is imbued with the spirit of Christ, and thus united in devotion to the all-present Father, and in love to mankind, the great end of the mission and death of our Lord has, in such a case, been accomplished; his gospel has been there "the power of God unto salvation;" but, in order to lead men to the cultivation of such a spirit, much importance is placed in the sacred records, on the *authority* of the Master, or, in other words, on the belief in him as the Christ of God. He taught with authority, and therefore millions of varying churches, in successive ages, have looked to him as a sure guide, and have believed that to cherish his spirit and obey his word is to please God and to promote their own present and eternal good. But if men entertain the belief that Jesus was but one of many who, through their own unaided efforts, have sought to know and do the truth, there is at once awakened a want of entire trust in him. Something of his spirit may have been but a morbid sentimentalism which the circumstances of his life may have engendered, and which we are rather to avoid than to cultivate; and thus that spirit

which faith in the Saviour's divine mission would fix, becomes evanescent and may soon disappear altogether.

Christianity is the spirit of a life: but it is more; it is dogmas too. One dogma, which "the foremost thinkers" do not seek to impugn, is the Oneness of God; another is his Fatherhood; and a third, which no ingenuity of criticism can remove, if we accept the *whole*, or even *any material part* of the New Testament record, is the office of Jesus as the messenger of God's grace. Is not the doctrine of the future life, as taught by Christ, also a dogma? We do not now speak of one theory or another of Christ's resurrection, one view or another of the mode of life that succeeds death, but the doctrine of a future life of retribution. This doctrine Christ taught clearly and distinctly. It surely is not "the spirit of a life," but a dogma resting on the teaching of him who came from God; and if, as some argue, he no more came from God than did Socrates or Seneca, then his doctrine on this all-important subject has no more authority than that of the Grecian sage or the Roman moralist. If men are satisfied to make the spirit of Christ the sole foundation of their church organisation, and treat his divine mission as only an eccentric notion of the old-fashioned and the superstitious, we fear that the spirit itself may soon disappear. The great vital force which has made it to some extent pervade Christendom would be removed, and gradually it would lose its influence. At all events, if we accept an historical Christianity at all, we must make a faith in the Christ the foundation principle of our church.

Mr. Tayler argues that "the question at issue among us is not Christianity and no Christianity, but between different methods of arriving at it." "All of us," he says, "are equally attached to Christianity, and equally revere the person and work of its great Founder." We are sure that Mr. Tayler writes only as he believes, but we regret that we cannot agree with him in his view of one of the parties whose controversy now agitates the Unitarian Church. As we regard it, the question is between *Christ* and *no Christ*, and there is too much evidence to show that some who claim to be not only members but ministers in our denomination, regard him

as in no extraordinary sense the Son of God, in no superior sense the Saviour, and that they cannot, therefore, revere his person and his work equally with those who welcome him as anointed of God to be the Saviour of men.

We are much gratified to find that Mr. Tayler does not join the popular cry of "an inclusive church," that is, as some argue, one free church in which all are to be embraced. Some minister lately stated, at a district Unitarian meeting in the South of England, that the trust-deeds of certain chapels provide simply that the buildings are "for the worship of Almighty God," intimating, as we understood him, that no restriction beyond that should be imposed, and seemingly suggesting that our church should have the same broad basis. That would be, in the true sense, "inclusive," and only to be objected to because it would exclude Atheists. To be sure, they would not seek to worship, but they might desire the chapel for conferences and secular lectures and discussions. Mr. Tayler, in the following passage in his third letter, limits the extent of freedom in our Christian churches:—

"It is quite possible that men may have been educated in Christianity, and may have even set out from a believing position, and yet from some assumption of what is necessary, in their view, to constitute a true religion, or from some want of application for the peculiar type of character which is the natural product of Christian faith, and to others the surest evidence of its divinity, have honestly arrived at the conclusion that the religion of Jesus of Nazareth, even when reduced to its spiritual essence, is founded on an erroneous conception of human life, and that the desires and endeavours which it inspires are hostile to the real progress of our race. I have known such men—pure-minded, earnest, upright, on their own theory sincerely devout. . . . At the same time, it is to me quite clear that, while we differ, as we do so irreconcilably, in our interpretation of the greatest fact in history, we cannot coalesce into one church."

Here, then, is the "exclusive" policy proposed by Mr. Tayler, who argues, we think fairly enough, that men may have something of the spirit of Christ—for what else are the purity and earnestness, the uprightness and devotion he commends in certain persons he has known—and yet not be qualified for membership in what he regards as the Christian Church. They differ from him

in the "interpretation of the greatest fact in history," and therefore he would exclude them. "If," he says, "they desire to gather themselves into churches for the cultivation of their religious life and the dissemination of their peculiar views respecting God and his dealings with man, so much the better for themselves and the world—let them have our unfeigned respect." So we say of all who irreconcilably differ from us in the view we hold of Jesus as the Christ; in their interpretation of the greatest fact in history they disagree with us, and we cannot coalesce in one church. Our policy is, we admit, in a sense exclusive. So is Mr. Tayler's, but no more than he, would we subject the brethren from whom we dissent to injury or insult; in the language of Mr. Tayler—"Where the interests of justice and freedom, and the rights and well-being of our fellow-creatures are concerned, let us meet them on that broad common ground, and act heartily with them as citizens and men." We cannot conceive of any who have clear and strong Christian convictions advocating a principle of ecclesiastical organisation which would admit men of all beliefs short of downright Atheism. Yet such seems to us the principle which, under the term "inclusive," has recently been contended for. It will be found to be unreasonable and impracticable, and any church that may be based upon it will be, truly, a house built on the sand.

THE LAST GOOD NIGHT.

Close her eye-lids—press them gently
O'er the dead and leaden eyes,
For the soul that made them lovely
Hath returned unto the skies;
Wipe the death-drops from her forehead,
Sever one dear golden tress,
Fold her icy hands all meekly,
Smooth the little snowy dress;
Scatter flowers o'er her pillow—
Gentle flowers, so pure and white—
Lay the bud upon her bosom,
There—now softly say, Good Night!

Though our tears flow fast and faster,
Yet we would not call her back;
We are glad her feet no longer
Tread life's rough and thorny track;
We are glad our Heavenly Father
Took her while her heart was pure;
We are glad He did not leave her
All life's trials to endure;
We are glad—and yet the tear-drop
Falleth; for, alas! we know
That our fireside will be lonely,
We shall miss our darling so.

While the twilight shadows gather,
We shall wait in vain to feel
Little arms, all white and dimpled,
Round our neck so softly steal;
Our wet cheek will miss the pressure
Of sweet lips so warm and red,
And our bosom sadly, sadly,
Miss that darling little head,
Which was wont to rest there sweetly;
And those golden eyes so bright,
We shall miss their loving glances—
We shall miss their soft Good Night!

When the morrow's sun is shining,
They will take this cherished form,
They will bear it to the church-yard,
And consign it to the worm.
Well—what matter? It is only
The clay dress our darling wore;
God hath robed her as an angel,
She hath need of this no more;
Fold her hands, and o'er her pillow
Scatter flowers all pure and white,
Kiss the marble brow, and whisper,
Once again, a last Good Night!

REPLY TO MR. MARTINEAU'S CRITICISM ON "A CHALLENGE ACCEPTED."

Mr. Martineau having, in *The Inquirer* of the 12th of August, demanded to know "where and by whom" the opinion "that Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church, or term of communion," had been maintained—and having subsequently stated that he had "often seen that opinion imputed but never had seen it maintained"—I offered a few examples, short, pointed, and unmistakeable, of the assertion of that principle; proving, as I thought, beyond all doubt, that it had been repeatedly avowed and strenuously advocated. Mr. Martineau, however, demurs to the proofs afforded.

First, he objects to my producing as evidence the statements of Irish theologians.

But why should I not produce them? Do not the words "*where and by whom*" cover the whole world? In the same breath with his objection, Mr. Martineau admits that "there was nothing in the wording of his question to preclude the appeal" to Irish testimony. Such being the case, he is the person in fault, if fault there be. Had he said that he wanted no witnesses but English ones, I should have understood him; but, looking to the sweeping language of his challenge, no one could understand it in that restricted sense to which he wishes it to be confined. He alleges that "his inquiry was *evidently* meant to have no wider range" than some "recent *English* discussions." He must pardon me for saying this was *not at all* evident. On the contrary, in his letter of the 12th of August, he stated that Mr. Ham "must have some grounds for his statement *beyond the limits of the* [recent] *discussion*;" and called for their production, if any such could be produced! He further argues that he could not be supposed "to hold himself responsible for the polemic utterances of a church *other than his own*." I beg to say, I never thought of holding him responsible for the polemic utterances even of his own church. I see much in the writings of Mr. Binns, Mr. Wright, Mr. Coupland, and others, for which I hope and believe Mr. Martineau would protest against being made

answerable; and I trust that, when he reflects on the matter, he will see that he has been very rash in so expressing himself as to appear to assume such responsibility. Yet I cannot be blind to the fact, that he seems to have penned his last letter under the idea that, somehow or other, he is called upon to act as counsel for the persons whose statements were brought forward in answer to his challenge: and he conducts their case in a manner which would bring reputation and briefs to a pleader at *nisi prius*.

Secondly—Mr. Martineau endeavours to put two of my witnesses out of court.

He says, "I must beg to strike out from the list the mere reports of conversations, unacknowledged by the speakers." The statements thus sought to be eliminated are those of Mr. M'Calmont, and the gentleman referred to in Mr. M'Alester's speech at Ballyclare. There is no ground for striking either of them out of the list, and I beg to reinstate them.

As respects Mr. M'Calmont, it is quite true that he not only did not acknowledge the report of his words uttered at Girvan, but pretended to resent it as "a calumny." But he only did so after the death of the truly Christian man on whose authority the statement was originally made; and the alleged calumny was, as Mr. Martineau probably does not know, proved by testimony so copious and convincing (see *Christian Unitarian*, Vol. ii., 317—321, 378—386), that no one who has impartially studied the question, can have any doubt that it is a melancholy truth. The highly respectable person to whom Mr. M'Calmont appealed for a refutation of the statement, did not say one word to impugn its accuracy, though he expressed his regret at its having been made public; and what is perhaps still more to the point, Mr. M'Calmont himself, in the very letter in which he protests against the alleged calumny, *expressly adopts the principle, that unrestricted religious liberty is the proper bond of union in the Christian Church*. His words are—"Mr. Scott was, I admit, not prepared to go the whole length of my principles, which are so well expressed [in the words following]: 'We have come together to lay the foundation stone of a temple dedicated to RELIGIOUS LIBERTY—*a*

temple under whose ample dome every individual who chooses to enter will be allowed to worship, in his own way, the one God and Father of all. The privilege of FREE AND FEARLESS INQUIRY *is the groundwork of the church we are now preparing to build.* PROVE ALL THINGS, will be the motto inscribed on its front, in characters of gold.' Mr. Scott was not prepared fully to adopt these principles; and, *instead of advocating Free Inquiry as a bond of union*, he contended for some definite test at the induction of ministers, to insure *the Christianity of the Church.*"—(See *The Non-Subscriber*, Vol. ii., pp. 174, 175). Here, then, is another express assertion of the very opinion of which Mr. Martineau is in quest; and I now append it as No. 7 to my list of "elegant extracts." If Mr. Martineau objects to the spoken words as "unacknowledged," I hope he will accept the written statement, which cannot be disavowed. As to the other gentleman referred to, we are persuaded that he will never disavow anything that he has either said or written, and in this case we have no doubt that he would glory in reiterating his sentiments. I beg to add that he is not an Irishman, nor at all mixed up in our Irish debates, as Mr. Martineau seems to imagine.

Thirdly—Mr. Martineau considers that the remaining examples, produced by me, are not applicable to the point which they are adduced to prove.

That point he mis-states. He says the point is, "That the proper basis of the Christian Church (*universally*) is 'Free Inquiry' or 'Religious Liberty,' *so that the ends of Christian fellowship are perfectly satisfied by any association of people, however heterogeneous in faith and in policy, who agree to let each other's religion alone.*" All the words above printed in Italics are now for the first time added to the terms of the challenge which I undertook to answer. I protest against this alteration of his demand. If Mr. Martineau does not wish to abide by the terms which he originally employed, *let him pen a new challenge;* but let him not seek to foist it upon us as if it were the old one. I admit that *some* of my extracts do not apply, specifically, to the challenge with this *ex post facto* appendage; but I maintain that they do, one and all, apply expressly to the *original* challenge, as I stated it, and as he gave it. He

says I have "cross-examined" the witnesses whom I have produced. I did no such thing. I simply put them into the box, allowed them to speak for themselves, and accepted their statements just as they gave them. It is Mr. Martineau himself who has not merely cross-examined them, but put them on the rack and wheel, so as to extract from their words a meaning which they do not convey, and which, I think I may say, no human being ever put upon them till he subjected them to the exercise of his procrustean ingenuity.

The real question is, whether any one has ever maintained "that Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church and term of Christian fellowship." In answer to this inquiry, I brought forward declarations from men of note, who affirmed with regard to their respective Churches,—(for which, on that account, they claimed the approval and admiration of their fellow-men,)—that "FEARLESS FREE INQUIRY is the groundwork" of one; that another is "*bound by no creed whatever*;" that it "*requires no test of belief whatever, as a condition of religious communion*;" that its "*essential bond of union is Religious Liberty*:" that "*absolute Religious Liberty is its principle*." These, I conceive, are very explicit statements, and very much to the point. Mr. Martineau, however, raises three objections. (1.) The witnesses, he says, are speaking of the Synods, &c., of which they are members, and these are "not churches at all" in his conception. Most Presbyterians, however, think that they are; and even persons who do not think them to be churches, in the strict sense of the word, do yet habitually speak of them by that term for brevity's sake; just as Unitarians in England speak of themselves in the aggregate as "the *Unitarian Church*," though there is no ecclesiastical organization which includes them all. (2.) Mr. Martineau says that my witnesses are speaking of the foundation principles of their own societies, (*churches* he will not allow them to be,) not of the Church Universal. This I look upon as a mere subterfuge. If a man boasts that the principle of his own Church is "Absolute Religious Liberty," "Free Inquiry," "No Creed," &c., &c., &c., and challenges for it the approbation of the world on that account, it is per-

fect folly to assert that he is not to be understood as affirming that such is "the *proper* basis of the Christian Church" everywhere, and the proper "term of Christian communion" throughout the world. Does Mr. Martineau expect to find any one professing to be a Christian, silly enough to declare, "I know and acknowledge that *Absolute Religious Liberty is not the proper basis of the Christian Church*, but I am happy and proud to say *it is the basis and ground-work of that to which I belong!*" No. By glorying in it as the basis of his own Church, he by necessary implication affirms that in his opinion it is the proper basis of the Church Universal. (3.) Mr. Martineau affirms that each of these witnesses simply means to say, "What unites us to each other and parts us from you is the resolve to carry on the mission of the Christian Church, *without taking verbal securities for the requisite amount of intellectual agreement*." I answer that they have said much more than this. If words have any meaning, they repudiate the necessity of any intellectual agreement whatsoever. "Absolute Religious Liberty" and "Fearless Free Inquiry" they declare to be the "ground-work," the "principle," "the bond of union" of their Church; and by necessary implication affirm that it is "the proper basis and term of Christian fellowship in all Churches."

Fourthly—Mr. Martineau makes a special defence for his friend Mr. Worthington.

That gentleman expressed his thankfulness to the brethren who had "welcomed him as a minister of the Church of Christ, that living Church, unfettered by creed, by tie, or by anything; a Church which holds as its members the good and the true of all ages and of every age." To my obfuscated intellect, this seemed distinctly to affirm that "Religious Liberty, or Free Inquiry, is the proper basis of the Christian Church." A church, "unfettered by creed or by tie, *or by anything*," seemed to me to be a church built purely on the ground of Religious Liberty or Free Inquiry. This view of the first part of the sentence seemed to be established, beyond a doubt, by the assertion that the "living Church of Christ holds as its members the good and the true of *all ages and of every age*." It cannot be doubted that in every past age of which we have records, there have been good and true

men who professed every existing variety and form of belief. Judaism has had its good men; Mahommedanism has had its good men; Heathenism has had its good men;—and there have been good and true men and women also,—who not only doubted, but denied the existence of God. There are many such at the present day. It is probable there will be such for many ages to come. All these, however, are declared by Mr. Worthington to be "members of the living Church of Christ." What can hold together such a miscellaneous concourse, in union as one society or Church, but the principle of "Absolute Religious Liberty," as Mr. John Porter expresses it; of "Fearless Free Inquiry," as it is called by Mr. Maginnis and Mr. M'Calmont; the principle that "Free Inquiry is its essential bond of union," as it is enunciated by Mr. Nelson; the principle, in short, that "the living Church of Christ is unfettered by creed, or or tie, or anything," to use the words of Mr. Worthington; that "Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church," to revert to those employed in Mr. Martineau's challenge?

But Mr. Martineau was present when this astounding declaration of the fundamental principle of Church union was made; and he sat silent; and I can easily understand how it is that, having done so, he now feels bound to take upon himself the defence of his young friend's sentiments. Let us see how he conducts it. "I find it stated," he says, "that the Christian Church, in discharging its mission, needs no verbal fetters of inflexible definition." *In discharging its mission!* Why are these words put in? Mr. Worthington is not speaking of the way in which the Church *should discharge its mission*, but of its own constitution, its essential principle, that which makes it a church, that which distinguishes it from all other societies, and keeps its members in fellowship with each other. The words introduced by Mr. Martineau can serve no other purpose but to draw away the reader's attention from the scope and intention of the sentence. He goes on to say that he finds it stated by Mr. Worthington, "that this Church needs no verbal fetters of inflexible definition"—which is true. Mr. Worthington declares that "the living Church of Christ is unfettered

by any creed." But he declares a great deal more. He declares that it is unfettered "*by anything:*" unfettered, therefore, even by that tacit undertaking "to work together for Christian ends," which Mr. Martineau seems to think is a sufficient foundation for Church union. Mr. Martineau "does not find it stated that in dispensing with these fetters and simply gathering together people who have nothing in common but free inquiry, the mission of the Church is accomplished." *Who ever said it was?* "On the contrary," he finds, "another principle of union suggested; the union of the good and true; the principle of inward Righteousness and Fidelity." True; but is this inconsistent with the acknowledgment of religious liberty or free inquiry as the basis of the Church? Mr. Martineau then goes on to paraphrase his young friend's meaning still further. "Mr. Worthington's sentiment, therefore, *I take* to be simply this, that those who unite in devoted service to *God and man*, need not predetermine the measure of their doctrinal agreement." But here the commentator differs widely from his text. Mr. Martineau lays it down that the members of the Church must agree in recognising the existence of *God*. Mr. Worthington repudiates any such basis of union. His Church is "unfettered by creed, or tie, or *anything*"—even by the acknowledgment of a deity, if his words have any meaning. Mr. Martineau then asks,—"Is Mr. John Scott Porter offended by the catholicity of Mr. Worthington's Church?" But, by his leave, *that is not the question at issue.* The question is not whether Mr. John Scott Porter is offended or is not offended with Mr. Worthington's sentiments: but *whether Mr. Worthington's statements come within the terms of Mr. Martineau's challenge.* I maintain that they do; and all his laboured expositions and most unnatural glosses only prove that it is impossible for him to show that they do not. I might say impossible *for any one*: for when so perfect a master of the art of extracting hidden meanings from other men's words has failed in this attempt, none other need make the trial. Mr. Martineau, in conclusion, adverts to a somewhat similar sentiment which was expressed by Justin Martyr. To me it would not matter much if Justin had said exactly the same thing with Mr.

Worthington, for I believe, and, as I think, have elsewhere proved, that Justin Martyr was one of the prime corrupters of the Church's faith: nevertheless, I shall, if life and health be spared, take another opportunity of shewing that the opinion asserted by Justin in the *First Apology*, differed considerably from that put forward in the very advanced declaration of Mr. Worthington, which, I am sorry to find, Mr. Martineau appears to adopt.

I conclude, for the present, by solemnly imploring him to weigh well the nature and tendency of those arguments which it has been my painful duty to expose in this communication. I implore him to consider whether, by putting on the passages cited in my former article glosses of which their authors probably never dreamed till he suggested them, interpretations which their language interpreted according to the common usage of words, will not bear, and restrictions, limitations, and qualifications *of which not one word is said in the passages themselves*, he is not giving to those who made them, and to the church of which he is an ornament, an example of the method of applying to their own statements, whenever it may be convenient to get rid of their obvious meaning, the doctrine of *mental reservation* which has hitherto been supposed to be the peculiar characteristic of the Jesuits of the school of Escobar. I implore Mr. Martineau to take this into his serious consideration, because I firmly believe that no one would more deeply regret such a result than himself; though it seems to me to be but too likely to follow from the methods of interpretation which he has adopted. If words are to be treated in this arbitrary manner, there is no declaration, however deliberate and solemn, which may not be made to signify anything or nothing, as expediency or interest may prompt. Even the ribaldry of Mr. W. C. Coupland, which was exposed in the last number of this magazine (see pp. 361—6), might, if expounded in the style here employed by Mr. Martineau, be interpreted so as to convey the sentiments of a reverently pious Christian.

J. Scott Porter.

Postscript.—It would, I believe, be easy for any one who had leisure and inclination for the task, to collect from the

columns of the "religious" newspapers, and from the speeches, sermons, and other publications which have lately been thrown forth from the press, examples in abundance of the assertion of that *liberal, inclusive*, or *non-exclusive* principle of church-union which Mr. Martineau "heartily despises," but which, when he penned his challenge to Mr. Ham, he "had never seen maintained." I have not leisure for such investigations; but, since writing my former article, I have casually met with the following passages. They are not given as answers to Mr. Martineau's challenge, nor could they be given as such, seeing that they were all written since it appeared in print; but they are produced to shew (and to me they seem to show convincingly) that the "obnoxious opinion," of the existence of which he appeared to be in doubt, really does exist; that it has a strong hold on certain minds of an "advanced" order; and that it is, from time to time, presented to public notice in all the solemnity of type. I take the first from a sermon lately published by Mr. William Chatterton Coupland (formerly a student in Manchester New College, London), under the title, "*Shall we not go Forward?*" (The italics are mine).

"A church, such as I conceive of it (it will be no *church* indeed, for that term bears its phenomenal sign on its front), will be a community of joyous wayfarers, *men who worship the Ideal* under no form or all forms, *and whose bond of union is a common sigh after Everlasting Perfectness*. The indispensable acknowledgment under such a society must be *unconditional liberty—a liberty which shall have no intellectual bounds—which, both in word and act, renounces every creed; and the condition of membership solely a confession of individual and social imperfection*. When we have such a 'Church' as that, I think the nations will flock thereto as to the prophetic 'Hill of the Lord,' and malice and uncharitableness will die away. In such a community the Spirit of God must be permitted to blow where it listeth, *yea, even though it be doubted to be a spirit of God at all*; and through every story of earth and heaven shall the human mind press, proving and questioning. In such a society *nought shall be secular and nought be sacred*, the triumphal march holy as the hymn, and the silent meditation grateful as a prayer. Chiefest of all, shall the thoughts of great men of all time and every clime be spread before a hungering people, and *whoever in India or Arabia, England or Syria, have stood closest to the skies, shall be esteemed venerable, and be listened to as a heavenly seer*. You smile perchance at this dream; but is it to be for ever a dream? And must the world await another millennial cycle till the thought becomes a deed? Who knows? *I think we should not wait so long, if some amongst us were more earnest.*"—(Pp. 12, 13).

This discourse is stated on its title-page to have been delivered "in the Unitarian Chapel, Bridgewater:" and, as one of the "polemic utterances" of the English Unitarian Church, it deserves some attention.

It may serve to illustrate, in some degree, what Mr. Coupland means by proposing that "the thoughts of the great men of all time, and every clime, shall be spread before a hungry people," to advert to the light in which he regards the holy Scriptures. "Popes and Bibles," he says, "*rather hinder than help us*," (p. 7). And he asks, "When will the time be ripe to say . . . *a Bible is a hindrance to human life?*" We take it for granted that in the Church, "as he conceives it," the reading of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures will be laid aside. Why should "the Church" tie itself down to the stated reading of a book which is only "a hindrance to human life?" It is plain that "the thoughts of great men," which are to be "spread before a hungering people," are to be other thoughts than those which are presented in the pages of prophets, apostles, and evangelists; but whence they are to come we are not told, save that we are informed, in the sublimely unintelligible gibberish of the modern intellectual school, that they are to be borrowed from "whoever in India or Arabia, in England or Syria, have stood nearest the skies"—and each of these (*who are they?*) is to "be esteemed venerable, and listened to as a heavenly seer!"

2. In *The Inquirer* of the 4th of November, I find a letter from Mr. J. Page Hopps, in which the writer says:—

"An earnest and conscientious man [the Rev. J. P. Clayden] asks [of Mr. Martineau], in the interests of conservatism [Qu.?], for a definition of Unitarianism, that he may know whether he can continue in a Unitarian Association; and the reply is not only a practical refusal to furnish a creed, *but a proposal to give up a church*, or rather *to develop a new church* from the old,—*undogmatic and open to all who will come*—'*unconditionally devoted to pure Christian pieties and charities,—recognizing as Christians all who are in harmony with God.*' . . . .

"*We should welcome with thankfulness* the establishment, in a healthy way, of *a really Free Church*, which should offer as its distinctive uniting bond these two thoughts—(1), That salvation is not conditioned by beliefs but by affections and conduct, and (2), *That the search for truth knows no limits in nature, and should bring no disqualifications in the Church.*"

I do not mean to say more on the question whether Mr. J. P. Hopps is right in claiming Mr. Martineau as an adherent of his views, than that the latter gentleman has solemnly repeated his declaration, that "no man more heartily despises" such views than he does, which ought to settle that point; or, if I say one word more, it is to express my astonishment that Mr. Hopps could have fallen into so palpable a blunder. But beyond all question he expresses the very opinion which, up to the 12th of August, Mr. Martineau had "never seen maintained."

3. In *The Inquirer* for the 16th of December, 1865, there appears a letter, entitled, "*An Inexclusive and Unsectarian Church*," from the pen of Mr. Andrew Davison, of Liverpool, in which the following passage occurs:—

"The various forms in which these attributes [of God] manifest themselves—the varying notions we each have of them—whether God's love to man is better shewn in his mysteriously taking upon himself the human form and dying upon the cross, in satisfaction of his own justice, or in raising up a specially endowed human being to illustrate the perfect life, and thus become a Saviour of the race; or in coming directly, as some think, to every human heart—*whether he speaks most divinely through Jesus, or Mahomet, or Joseph Smith, or the myriad voices of nature and all highly endowed human beings*—it is still the over-soul of love and truth which touches the human affections and intellect—it is still the living God to whom, however variously conceived of by the worshippers, the worship of the spirit is paid; and *why the whole human family*, with its common wants and frailties, aye, and its distinctive wants and frailties, *might not bow down together* before Him whose universal benevolence meets every want, both common and distinctive, fortifies every frailty, and stirs all his children by one means or other to aspire towards himself, *I cannot see*."

After reading these extracts, to which, as I have said, I believe that many more might easily be added, if it were worth while to hunt for them, I presume that whatever doubt Mr. Martineau might have felt before this correspondence began, he can now feel none, that there are at the present day *some* persons—perhaps many—who maintain that *Religious Liberty, or Free Inquiry*, is the only proper basis of the Church and term of fellowship among its members. Leaving these gentlemen to exercise as they deem proper their right of Free Inquiry, and to enjoy their Religious Liberty in their own way, I unite with Mr. Martineau in "heartily despising" any such principle of church-union; and I further must, in the exercise of my religious liberty, declare that in my opinion a society established as they wish their church to be, would be no *Christian* Church. Of course they are free to call it by what name they please.

I observe that the Editor of *The Inquirer* has thought it consistent with his own character as a lover of fair play, and with his position as "*The Weekly Organ of the Unitarians of England*," to give Mr. Martineau's reply to my former Article at full length, while *not one word of my paper was allowed to appear in his columns!* This, in Ireland, would not be reckoned fair play; but in England it would seem as if it is so regarded, or else it is understood that any sort of injustice may properly and honourably be inflicted on a "Belfast Professor," or the cause which he espouses.

J. S. P.

THE THORN IN THE FLESH.

A MINISTER, seated with his Bible-Class, on coming to the passage—"Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not?" said, I think it as well to remark here, that I do not understand these words, nor, out of the many explanations given of them, is there one that satisfies me. I think we must be satisfied with the conclusion to which Locke arrived—than whom there is no more judicious expositor—"What this baptizing for the dead was, I confess I know not." This text, therefore, must remain among the things hard to be understood in the great Apostle's Epistles, to clear up which a higher degree of light is required than we can expect will be vouchsafed to us in the present imperfect state of being. We may, however, be more fortunate with regard to another text, which has, notwithstanding, much exercised the ingenuity of commentators,—the "thorn in the flesh," mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 7, and on which many suppositions have been hazarded, the most likely one of which is, that it was a paralysis of the frame, arising from an overstrain of the nerves consequent on the extraordinary, the almost overpowering revelations which had been vouchsafed to him, and of which he gives a brief account at the commencement of the chapter. "Caught up to the third heaven," though whether spiritually or bodily he could not say; "caught up to paradise," close by the oracle of God, where he heard "unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." It was the glory of the Shekinah, such as Moses saw on the Mount, and which made his face to shine so that he was obliged to wear a veil whilst communicating with the Israelites. Paul was wonderfully impressed with what he saw and heard, and, no doubt, his bodily faculties were at first overwhelmed, and subsequently impaired by the celestial glories; and we have no difficulty in supposing that this, the natural result of such a display to him of the divine excellences, would be as a thorn in the flesh, constantly irritating, and as constantly reminding him that, after all, he was but a man, with passions and infirmities like other men; that though thus highly

favoured, his treasure was still in an earthen vessel, "that the excellency might be of God and not of man."

Now, we can all understand what a thorn in the flesh means; we can realize it to ourselves, for, ten to one, we have each felt it literally so; we have plucked the flower, and the thorn, unseen, for the moment unfelt, has entered the hand, and most irritating has it been;—very small—almost imperceptible to the sight, yet there, making itself most painfully known by a slight, unguarded pressure. It seems a thing hardly worth notice, and yet it produces much uneasiness, whilst it very often, from its very minuteness, defies extraction; and so it remains, as an ever-present memento, a teasing thing, capable indeed of seriously inconveniencing us, and of interfering with our comfort, and, indeed, our usefulness; or it may be a larger thorn, festering in the body, spreading inflammation and agony over the surrounding parts, too deeply seated also for removal save at the expense of the greatest hazard, as well as suffering. So we can make the Apostle's case our own, and we can imagine how he would pray and beseech once and again that it might depart from him. Suppose it to have been a disorder of the nerves. This many know to be a terrible infliction—one of the hardest for the human system to bear. It was, he tells us, the messenger of Satan to buffet him. Something put upon him to abate, it may be, any tendency of the natural man to plume himself on the distinguishing mark of Divine favour he had received from the revelations made to him. That the supposed author of all ill, the arch-enemy of mankind, was concerned in the visitation, is a monstrous idea, worthy of the dark ages. The messenger of Satan sent to buffet him can mean only that God, in his providence, inflicted some mortification to keep him humble and submissive to the Divine will, and as such the pious servant of Jesus received it. We know that he elsewhere says, quoting the description of his opponents, but, no doubt, true in itself, that his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible. Paul was, if we may credit tradition, slight, and was in stature of anything rather than a commanding presence, whilst the weakness of his nerves would probably give a hesitation to his speech, and take much

from the gracefulness of his delivery; he would, with stammering words and ungainly action, utter the message wherewith he was charged. So much the more would it be seen that the power of Christ rested on him—that his strength was made perfect in weakness—yet we cannot be surprised that he felt all this most keenly. The Apostle was no stranger to the eloquence of the schools, nor the stress laid by the Greeks, and the Jews also, on the enticing words of man's wisdom, set off by all the arts of oratory, the figure, the tone, the manner in which what was said in public was endeavoured to be enforced on the attention. We may well suppose that Paul felt his deficiency here, and hence thrice he besought the Lord that this impediment, as he deemed it, to his success might be removed; but his prayer, for the wisest reasons, was not granted; the infirmity, sorely pressing as it must have been, was not removed. The faithful servant must labour on in spite of the burden laid on him. It was a cross—his cross—and he must yet bear it—"My grace is sufficient for thee." So he resolves, and how nobly let those who have borne, or yet bear, the ills of the flesh appreciate; he resolves to glory in his infirmities, to take pleasure in all manner of earthly evil for Christ's sake. Surely, in nothing was he behind the very chiefest of the Apostles.

Has the thorn in the flesh no lessons for us? Many, if we rightly understand, and more if we rightly improve the visitation itself, and the temper in which it was received by the Apostle to the Gentiles.

1. We cannot but perceive that no rank in life, no intellectual eminence, no excellence of character, can secure the possessor against the common lot, that of pain, of accident, of bodily ill. Money is no defence, wisdom is no defence, virtue itself is no defence against these. There is one event that happeneth to all. It may be said that the case under consideration falls not under the general rule. We think it does, and eminently so; for granting, as must be done, that the revelation to Paul was miraculous, the result on his health and his future life on earth was quite natural; and, according to the ordinary course of things, Paul dwelt in an earthly tabernacle as every one of us does, and he was subject to the vicissitudes of mortality just as we all are. And

genius, too, of the highest kind has no exemption. Genius has its thorn, and in the flesh too, in the most sensitive parts of the frame. Goodness enjoys no immunity. In the best, the most humble among us, and because the most humble, the best, there is too much of a disposition to thank God because they are not as other men; and it is often in this cherished position that the feelings are wounded the most deeply. Something is sent to warn us that we are but men, with enough, and far more than enough, to convince us that we wear the garment spotted with the flesh; that we need to be more watchful, more zealous, more ready to strengthen the things within us ready to die. So we find we are not so very good after all, nor so vastly superior to others as self-love had led us to imagine, and the thorn sharply felt is not without its use. It is recorded of Pascal that he wore near to his body a belt full of iron spikes, and that when any one spoke to him of his talents or his goodness, he was accustomed to press the belt that the sharp goads might find a painful entrance into his flesh. We know this was not needed; still our humility may serve the purpose of Pascal's belt. Whilst we may remember that holiness, virtue, genius, learning, united in Paul, still he had his thorn, and it was given to him lest he should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations.

2. We learn our entire dependence on God. Nor can we always choose our lot in life, nor the things coincident with that lot. The messenger was not welcome to Paul; he could not be; he would have had him depart; but this was not permitted; the bidding must be done; the work must receive its accomplishment. True is it that man proposes whilst God disposes, and thus he ordains our lot; the rose with the briar; the book sweet as honey to the taste, in the stomach bitter and painful. Trials will come, for it is the very end of our being in the present state that we shall be tried; by no other means, as would appear, can we be trained to immortality. We think all this hard, and hard doubtless much of it is, to be borne. But we are led to look out of, and beyond our sufferings, to God; we feel our need of him, his assistance, his care, his protection, and love. He has,

then, the first place in our thoughts, and we are drawn to him by a sense of our imperfection, our nothingness. We pray to him, we beseech him, we throw ourselves into his arms, and take hold of his strength. The thorn may not be taken away, but strength will be given to bear it, and we may come to glory in it, as a token that the Lord loveth whom he chasteneth, that the power may rest upon us.

3. Paul teaches us by his example that it is lawful to pray for deliverance from pain, anxiety, distress of any kind. He thrice besought the Lord; the Saviour prayed earnestly that the cup might, if possible, be removed, yet "not as I will, but as thou wilt." Our religion knows nothing of the insensibility of the Stoic. It never tells us that pain is a thing external to ourselves, and therefore not to be noticed. It does not render us indifferent to the calamities of life. Paul was, we may well suppose, a man of a highly susceptible disposition, with a frame tremblingly alive to the changes incident to our mortal state. He might have feared that the discipline under which he suffered would hinder the success of that Gospel to the preaching of which his whole soul was devoted, and that now he was in danger of spending his strength in vain. He prays; the petition is rejected, yet he is content and submissive. And there may be that with any one of us which disturbs our peace, interferes with the daily round of our duties, and occasionally makes even life burdensome. Debility, the couch swimming with tears, the being, like the prophet, shut up, when the prospect of usefulness abroad seems the fairest, annoyances from the world, from unreasonable men, depression of spirits, the bitterness of the heart known to the sufferer alone. Oh! the thorn may be a member of the family, long tried, still loved, still prayed for, yet perverse, sullen, intractable,—a friend apparently sticking closer than a brother, and yet now falsifying fond expectations. The world—cold, careless, sweeping contemptuously by at the hour of the veriest need—a heavy and crushing loss of earthly substance, a fancied trouble such as those make to themselves who have none of the real calamities of the world to vex them;—still from any of these deliverance may be prayed for; and if it come not, yet the integrity

must be held fast; the pious heart will in all things give thanks.

4. We must believe that, amidst our heaviest trials, the purposes of God concerning us must be ever right, and may be best promoted by our sufferings, or our seeming want of success. The world worships success—will not believe that the unsuccessful can have any merit—yet some of the greatest, the wisest, the purest, the best of our race have not been successful, have not succeeded according to the expectations of others, or perchance their own expectation. We will not give heed to the impious remark of one in high place on a picture of the Saviour on the cross—"Behold the fate of a reformer!"—but we will reverently call to mind how he endured the cross and despised the shame, and how all this suffering and all this ignominy were borne because it was the Father's will concerning him. And the Father may be glorified in our pains and in our obedience, and through us may be working out some of the grand designs of his providence. Well, we are instruments in his hands, and he forms us to his will as the potter doth the clay. He is served by the Archangel and by the worm, by Paul, by Apollos, by Cephas, and the sufferings abounding in them—served by us, only let the serving on our part be willingly, not of constraint, that thus the thorn may do its part, though most painfully, to bring us to the presence where there is fulness of joy.

5. We must sum up the present remarks by observing that the thorn was sent on Paul; he did not seek for it, nor for its own sake did he desire it—there would have been neither wisdom nor humility in this—yet many professed followers of the Apostle have sought for pain of body in order to mortify the flesh and subdue sinful inclinations. We may not doubt their sincerity, though we cannot be convinced of the soundness of their minds: we are called to liberty, and have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear. There have been those in all ages who have sought to make a hell of earth to merit heaven, and they have had their reward here—the misplaced sympathy and applause of numbers—thus they have indemnified themselves for the bodily privations and

tortures they have endured. Paul had nothing of this "crazy piety," this "surly devotion," and yet no one had more of the spirit of self-denial, and no one ever more courageously or more completely abandoned the world for the high object of benefiting the immortal interests of his fellow-men. So we need not go out of our way to make a cross, but we are called on to bear the cross that lies in our way, and not to pass it by, or shift the burden to the shoulders of another. In nothing of the spirit of ascetism, yet in that of Christian love, we should aim to pass through the world, enduring the thorn, if we must have one, and trying to pluck out the thorn from our brother, that we may all rejoice together in the great day of the Lord. B.

INTELLIGENCE.

STANHOPE STREET NATIONAL SCHOOL.

The annual examination of the Unitarian Religious Instruction Classes connected with this School took place on Wednesday, December 20th, and was considered very successful. The children had prepared written answers to a variety of questions on the 21st chapter of St. John's Gospel, and in a manner which shewed they well understood that portion of the Sacred History. They were then examined *viva voce* by Rev. T. Bowring in Dr. Watts's Catalogue of Scripture Names and on the 17th chapter of Acts, the replies evincing correct acquaintance with the scenes and circumstances of the Apostolic narrative. As but one half hour in any week can, according to the rules of the School, be given to this kind of instruction, and many of the children are quite young, their progress in Biblical knowledge is most praiseworthy, whilst it proves that the day of small things must not be despised.

Model School Unitarian Religious Instruction Classes.—These, as the preceding, are under the care of Rev. T. Bowring, and the examination was conducted by him on the following day, December 21st. The order of proceedings was nearly similar to the other, only the scholars were generally older and of a higher grade. The pupils first presented written exercises on the last chapter of Luke, which manifested study and care on their part. Mr. Bowring then proceeded to examine them on some portions of "The Guide to Christ," an admirable little manual, and the answers were given with much verbal accuracy, whilst the replies made to queries for which no printed answers were provided, shewed that they fully entered into the spirit of their task. They

then stood a long and close examination on the 27th and 28th chapters of the Acts, displaying more than common knowledge of the geographical allusions connected with Paul's voyage to Rome. At the conclusion, the pupils were very affectionately addressed and congratulated by Rev. John Jellie. At the examination of both Schools suitable premiums were presented to the more deserving.

SCOTTISH UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

The anniversary sermons of the Scottish Unitarian Association were preached on Sunday, November 26th, in St. Mark's Chapel, Edinburgh, by the Rev. James Drummond, of Manchester. Sermons in connexion with the same association were also preached in Glasgow by the Rev. J. C. Street, of Newcastle. In both places the services were numerously attended.

The annual meeting of the members and friends of the Scottish Unitarian Christian Association was held on the 27th November, in the Masonic Hall, Edinburgh—the president (Mr. Ivie Mackie, of Manchester) in the chair.

Mr. CROSSKEY read the report, of which the following are extracts:—

"Your committee report, with great satisfaction, that their relationship with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association continues to be most hearty, and that they owe to the liberality of that body the means of greatly extending their missionary activity. It has appeared the wisest plan to work from certain definite centres, instead of scattering over too large an area the efforts of the association. Aberdeen has been the centre from which the Rev. W. Sharman has worked, visiting Dundee once a month. The result has been the formation of a congregation at Dundee, which now requires the services of a special missionary. Your committee have great pleasure in reporting that they have engaged Mr. Henry Williamson (now a student in the Home Missionary Board) to become their second missionary on the conclusion of his academical course. Mr. Williamson conducted services in Dundee, and, with such acceptance, that your committee have decided to station him in that town, and he will enter upon his duties early in February as the missionary of the two associations.

"The Rev. W. Sharman will remain stationed at Aberdeen, and the committee believe that his continued residence in that city will be of great service to our cause. Your committee trust that he will receive support and sympathy proportionate to his labour. Aberdeen, it must be remembered, is a university city, and seeds of thought sown there will bear fruit, not only in Scotland, but wherever Scotchmen journey. Aberdeen and Dundee have not, however, alone received the attention of your committee. Our work is essentially educational. While concentrating our efforts chiefly on certain centres, we must not neglect the diffusion of our principles through the community at large.

"At Montrose, the Rev. W. Sharman lectured and found friends. The audience numbered one hundred and fifty, and a quarterly lecture is greatly desired.

"At Stonehaven Mr. Sharman lectured to an audience of upwards of two hundred, and he hopes the association will authorise a short course of lectures as soon as convenient.

"At Paisley, a course of Monday evening lectures was given by the Revs. J. C. Street, W. Sharman, R. B. Drummond, and H. W. Crosskey, under the auspices of the association, while Mr. Crosskey conducted several Sunday evening services.

"At Greenock, Mr. Crosskey delivered a lecture, and eight members of the association have been enrolled, while a number of inquirers meet upon Sunday evenings. The occasional service of a missionary is earnestly requested, and all local expenses will be defrayed.

"At Stirling, Mr. Crosskey also lectured on behalf of the association, and received an attentive hearing, with some hearty expressions of sympathy."

The treasurer's report, which showed a balance of £60, was then read and unanimously approved.

The following gentlemen were elected the office-bearers for the ensuing year:—President, Mr. Ivie Mackie; vice-presidents, Mr. George Hope, Mr. H. Briggs, Mr. W. Teacher, Dr. Daun, and Mr. Peter Callender; treasurer, Mr. W. J. Warren; secretaries, the Rev. R. B. Drummond, and the Rev. W. Crosskey.

In the evening, a soiree was held in the Masonic-hall, under the auspices of of the association. There was a large attendance; and the chair was again occupied by Mr. MACKIE. Tea having been served,

The CHAIRMAN addressed the meeting, commencing by saying that he had very great pleasure in presiding over so large and respectable an assemblage as he saw before him. It was in the year 1825 that he first heard Unitarian doctrines preached in Edinburgh, so that there could not now be many living who were members of the congregation at that time. Then, or soon afterwards, he became a Unitarian, and he had never since swerved from the doctrines he adopted, or regretted that he had joined the body. On the contrary, every day's experience had added strength to his convictions.

The Rev. W. SHARMAN was the next speaker. He said that, during the past year, he had seen far more missionary work in Scotland than he was able to see in the preceding year. Wider experience had shown him that wherever Unitarians went they found willing and attentive audiences of people fully prepared to receive the truth. For instance, some six weeks ago he went to Stonehaven, a town about twenty miles from Aberdeen, and containing a population of about 3,000. There he found an audience of upwards of 200, and at the conclusion of the services he received visits from a great number of people who assured him of their sympathy with the cause, and told him that there was a sufficient number of persons attached to the Unitarian views to constitute a congregation.

Addresses were subsequently delivered by the Rev. James Drummond, the Rev. J. C. Street, Mr. Briggs, the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, and the Rev. A. Gordon.

UNITARIAN CONGREGATION, TORONTO, CANADA.

The annual festival of the Jarvis Street Unitarian Church of Toronto, was held on the evening of the 27th of November. A large number were present, many of whom were members of other denominations. As soon as the tables were cleared, Dr. B. Workman took the chair, with the pastor of the Congregation, Rev. J R. Lavelle, on his right, and Rev. Professor Hincks, of University College, on his left. After some excellent music, Professor Hincks addressed the meeting. Without entering upon a laboured exposition of the Unitarian doctrines, he claimed for himself and fellow-believers sincerity and fair treatment from others. He then referred to the unjust feelings which other Christians cherished towards them, and entered into a defence of the doctrine held by his Church. He next set forth our right to stand fairly before the public, and presented reasons why our doctrines were purer and better than others, and concluded with an appeal to his hearers to be faithful, and stand up for the truth.

OBITUARY.

Died, at the Glebe, Dunmurry, on December 18th, the Rev. Henry Montgomery, LL D., in the 78th year of his age and the 50th of his ministry. It is with deep sorrow we record the removal of this distinguished man; for although he had nearly reached his eightieth year, his mind was still vigorous, and, till the appearance lately in a more severe form, of the terrible malady which terminated his life, his many friends and admirers hoped that he might yet be spared for years in the useful and benevolent labours to which his life was devoted.

Henry Montgomery was born in the parish of Killead, County Antrim, on January 20, 1788. He received his classical education chiefly at Crumlin Academy, and at an early age repaired to Glasgow College, with a view to entering the ministry in the Presbyterian Church. Soon after receiving license to preach the Gospel from the Presbytery of Templepatrick, he was invited to become pastor of the Congregation of Donegore (to which Dr. Cooke was afterwards appointed), but declined because it would have been necessary for him to sign the Westminster Confession. He afterwards accepted a call to the Congregation of Dunmurry. Here, in addition to his ministerial duties, he engaged in the arduous work of teaching, and for some years superintended the education of a limited number of pupils; but in the year 1817, the situation of Head Master of the English Department in the Belfast Academical Institution having become vacant, he offered himself as a candidate, and was elected. The superior ability which he had already

displayed as a public speaker may have led to his success ; but possibly it was due, in some degree, also to the liberal principles which he entertained being in harmony with those which prevailed among the founders and supporters of that important seminary. Although he was obliged to reside in the Institution, and give the greater part of every day to his duties there, he was retained by his indulgent Congregation as their pastor, officiating regularly for them on the Sunday, and giving whatever portion of time he could spare for pastoral duty.

About the year 1822, the General Synod of Ulster began to be disturbed on the question of Subscription. The meeting of Synod was held that year, we believe, in Newry ; and although there were only the first symptoms of disagreement, these gradually increased, to the year 1826, when it became the all-engrossing subject at the successive annual meetings, till the year 1829, when the Remonstrants withdrew, and formed themselves into a distinct body. In the controversy which thus divided the Synod, Mr. Montgomery took a very prominent part. He had never subscribed the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Presbytery from which he received license, and that also by which he was ordained, being Non-Subscribing Presbyteries. We believe also that the minister under whom he was brought up held Unitarian views. These favouring circumstances may have contributed to strengthen in his breast the liberal religious views which from boyhood he seems to have entertained. At all events, from the time he entered the ministry he was decidedly Unitarian, adopting that scheme of Anti-trinitarian doctrine commonly known as Arian ; and when an outcry was raised in the Synod against what was sometimes spoken of as "the Arian heresy," but more frequently as "New Light," Mr. Montgomery never sought to conceal his views, but openly declared them, wherever occasion required. Against the attempts of the majority of the Synod to impose a Calvinistic creed, he strove with persevering energy ; and it was in the discussions which took place from the year 1826 till the time of the disruption of the body his most powerful speeches were delivered : those especially which he made at Coleraine, Strabane, Cookstown, and Lurgan will yet be remembered by many as most brilliant displays of eloquence. His commanding presence, full and clear voice, and correct elocution contributed much to give effect to his speeches ; and only a few days ago we were told of one of the most orthodox of the young ministers who were present at the meeting of Synod at Cookstown in 1828, who was for the time carried away by his address, when, in one part of his speech, rebutting the hackneyed charge of "denying the Lord that bought him," he distinctly expressed his faith in the religion of Christ, and repeated, in tones of mingled pathos and exultation, those familiar lines—

> "Jesus, my Lord ! I know his name—
> His name is all my boast ;
> Nor will he put my soul to shame,
> Nor let my hopes be lost."

The abilities and eloquence which he employed in battling unsuccessfully for the cause of Christian freedom in the General

Synod of Ulster, he applied in founding and building up a new Church, which might be a sanctuary for those whose conscience would not suffer them longer to remain in the Church of their fathers. It is only right here to remark, that both in his struggles in the General Synod, and in his labours to organize and establish the Remonstrant Synod, he was ably assisted by many worthy and gifted men, most of whom he survived; but it is no disparagement to others, whose memory is still gratefully cherished by the liberal Presbyterians of Ulster, to say that in eloquence and in personal influence Henry Montgomery was foremost of the noble band; and by his exertions obtained from the Government all the advantages for their new Church which they had enjoyed in the one which they left. For a number of years the Remonstrant Synod was characterized by peace and unity, but latterly dissensions sprung up within it, and he to whom so long all were wont to look up for counsel and guidance, and who was ever ready to use his large influence, not only for the good of the Church which he loved, but also for the benefit of every member whom he could aid, was regarded by some of the younger brethren with indifference or distrust. Without entering into the questions that have led to such divisions, it may suffice to say that those who differed from Dr. Montgomery interpreted the constitution of the Remonstrant Synod as being more comprehensive in its principles than its founders ever designed it to be; and he who toiled so nobly for the establishment of the infant Church, lived to see it agitated by strife and weakened by dissenssion.

The name of Dr. Montgomery is intimately connected with the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. An attempt was made to deprive Unitarians, both in England and Ireland, of their church property. For a time, the worst apprehensions were entertained, and there was every reason to fear that the buildings and funds which Unitarians had derived from their predecessors, and which they had themselves improved, and even the grave-yards in which their kindred were interred, should be wrested from them. A vigorous and united effort was made by Unitarians in this country and in England to obtain protection, and it is admitted that the assistance of Dr. Montgomery was invaluable; his address and tact, his intimate knowledge of the subject, and the lucid statements which he placed before members of the Government and others, largely contributed to the procuring of that Act which secured Unitarian property against contemplated plunder.

As a public speaker, Dr. Montgomery was known far beyond the limits of his own church; and wherever the cause of freedom, civil, political, or religious, was to be advocated, his services were cheerfully given. In the agitation which preceded the carrying of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, he took a prominent part; and, differing though he did most widely from his Roman Catholic countrymen in religious opinions, he worked as ardently for their emancipation as if he had belonged to their own church. As a preacher, no Unitarian in Ireland drew such large congregations, and probably none in England. Wherever he preached, many not only of his own denomination, but of others also, thronged to hear him; and although in later years a diversity of opinion respecting the

principles of church organisation tended to lessen the admiration in which he was held by the English brethren, and subjected him at times to unbecoming and most undeserved censure, we believe there is not one on either side of the Channel that has not heard with deep regret of his removal; not one who, despite of differences, did not esteem and admire him.

In the summer of 1839, Dr. Montgomery resigned his situation in the Belfast Academical Institution, and took up his residence in the Glebe belonging to his congregation. Relieved from the drudgery of teaching, he gave much of his time to public matters, and to the affairs of the Non-Subscribing Church. He was appointed Professor of Church History, Moral Philosophy, and Pastoral Theology in connexion with the Non-Subscribing Association, and thus he had much to do with the training of candidates for the ministry. The instructions of such a man, especially in Pastoral Theology and Pulpit Eloquence, must have been of great advantage to those who received them; and his loss, in this respect as well as in many others, will be long and deeply felt in the church of which he was so great an ornament.

Dr. Montgomery was one of the Governors of the District Lunatic Asylum; and was on the Board of Directors of the Presbyterian Widows' Fund Association, to the interests of which he gave much attention. The University of Glasgow, in which he had been educated, conferred on him the degree of LL.D. as a recognition of his literary attainments.

The religious opinions which Dr. Montgomery embraced in earlier life he continued to entertain till the time of his death, only holding them more firmly and valuing them more highly as the end of life drew nigh. To those who knew him intimately, such a remark might seem superfluous, but it was sometimes whispered while he was yet living, and it has been publicly stated since his death, that his opinions had undergone much change. In such a statement there is not even a shadow of truth.

For some time before his death, the disease with which he was afflicted gave him intense agony, from which he could only gain relief by powerful and frequent opiates; but through all his trials he uttered no rebellious word; the religious principles that directed him in life seemed powerful to sustain him in approaching death. The tidings of his decease spread general sorrow, and gratifying notices of his life and character appeared in several Belfast papers of opposite political and religious views. His funeral, which took place on Wednesday morning, December 20, was most numerously attended, the leading inhabitants of Belfast and the neighbouring districts, of all parties, attending to mark their respect for the great man who had been taken away; and it was especially touching to see ministers of all Protestant denominations,—and conspicuous among them, though in feeble health, him who had been his ablest opponent in the General Synod five and thirty years before,—joining in the funeral procession, and uniting to pay a solemn tribute of regard to genius, worth, and eloquence. The funeral service was conducted by the Rev. William Crozier, Minister of the Remonstrant Congregation of Rademon. After reading a portion of Scripture, the reverend gentleman sketched the character and hopes

of the upright man, and then, applying his remarks to the departed, he said :—

"I am sure, my friends, you all feel the application of these sentiments to the great and good man who, after a long, useful, and distinguished life, has passed away from amongst us, and whose mortal remains we are about to consign, with profound regret, to their kindred dust. It would be presumptuous then, in me, to intrude at present on your feelings—even if I possessed ability for the task—by a lengthened eulogy upon the character and virtues of the departed. These are known to you better than any language of mine could convey ; and a few affectionate words must therefore suffice—ere we take a final leave of the departed, and his remains be hidden from our view—to express our deep sense of his irreparable loss to his afflicted family, to his attached congregation, to his many friends, to the Christian Church, and to the community at large. It is no common spectacle of mourning that we witness to-day. The torch of a great and splendid intellect, which has long shone with brightness on the pathways of the world, is quenched. It will be seen no more. "A master in Israel" is fallen asleep. An eminent servant of God has paid the debt of nature, and "he shall return to his house no more, neither shall his place know him any more." "His golden bowl of life is broken, his pitcher broken at the fountain, his wheel broken at the cistern." "His dust has returned to the earth as it was ; and his spirit has returned to God who gave it." "He goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets." I am persuaded there are many hearts in this great funeral concourse that are penetrated with grief for the loss of this general friend, and father of his people ; that they are overcome by the thought which they can scarcely yet realize—that they will never again feel the friendly grasp of his hand—never more meet the kindly beam of his eye—never more hear the tones of his voice that have so often rejoiced them in the social scene, comforted them in their afflictions and sorrows, and elevated and hallowed their spiritual souls in this sacred house of prayer. Alas for us ! and is it come to this, that the great heart which never quailed before the face of man—which has battled manfully for God's holy truth for half a century amidst the storms of the world and the strife of tongues—but which was at the same time filled with the kindly influences of our nature, has ceased to beat, and is now before us in the deep quiet and stillness of death ? Is that eye, whose lightning flash could rebuke, with indignant scorn, the wrong-doer and the hypocrite, and whose mild, benignant light could woo the child to his knee, closed for ever in rayless night ? Is that tongue, whose wonderful eloquence has enchained admiring thousands by its powerful charm, now mute for ever ? Yes, my friends, it is so ! Dr. Montgomery, that familiar, distinguished, and venerated name, is now the name of one that *was*, and is spoken among us to-day only in the hushed accents of bereavement and sorrow. The cheerful, joyous, and instructive companion—the wise, kind, and judicious adviser—the accomplished and eloquent orator—the enlightened and useful member of society—the affectionate husband and father—the learned divine—the great light of that section of the Christian Church whose faith he upheld—the

pious and devoted minister of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom he gloried—lives now but in our thoughts, our hearts, and our memory. How often, during the long period of his ministerial life and labours, has this house resounded with the earnest and impressive tones of his voice, on the great themes of holy duty, Christian faith, and Divine love! Long, long will they be remembered by his attached and mourning flock, when they shall in after time occupy these pews, and tread these courts, while he rests in silence under their shadow. Let the dead speak to the living in the tones of memory, and often recal his faithful words to cheer and aid them in their way heavenward, till at last they meet him again as a happy and exalted spirit in the Kingdom of God. Now let us say in the fulness of our heart—farewell, Christian brother! Beloved and venerated friend and father of this Christian flock, farewell! You have left a blank. Be our days many or few on earth, we never shall look upon your like again. Rest, Christian warrior, rest; "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust;" rest in your long and dreamless slumbers, till the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God shall awake all the dead to renewed life and consciousness. Servant of God, well done! You are gone to your high reward. "You have fought a good fight," "you have finished your course, you have kept the faith; henceforth, (we doubt not,) there is laid up for you a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge will give you at that day." "And I heard a voice from Heaven saying unto me, Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."

On the following Sunday, the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, of Holywood, preached a funeral sermon, in Dunmurry Meeting-house, to a large congregation.

It is much to be regretted that few, if any, of Dr. Montgomery's manuscri ts are in a state which would justify their publication. His great fluency in speaking rendered it unnecessary for him to write out in full his sermons and lectures; but we trust that a collection may be made of his principal speeches and letters, so that his admiring friends may have some permanent memorial of so gifted and so good a man.

Died, at Comber, County Down, on December 17, Sarah Jane, wife of the Rev. John Orr, aged forty-two years.

Died, at Dromore, on December 2, Margaret, eldest daughter of the late William Heron, Esq.

Died, at Kilwaughter, near Larne, on December 10, Martha, relict of the late Mr. John M'Ninch, Kilwaughter, at the advanced age of 92 years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."—JOHN xvii. 3.

VOLUME V.

FEBRUARY, 1866—JANUARY, 1867.

BELFAST:

UNITARIAN DEPOSITORY, 59, UPPER ARTHUR STREET.

LONDON: WHITFIELD, GREEN, & SON, STRAND.

1866.

BELFAST:
PRINTED BY ALEX. MAYNE,
HIGH STREET.

CONTENTS.

FEBRUARY.

	PAGE
Wanted—A Name,	1
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	6
The "Baths" of the New Testament,	13
"The British and Foreign Unitarian Association,"	18
Christianity a Divine Gift, not a Human Achievement,	21
A Note or Two on Rev. J. S. Porter's Reply,	26
Late Meeting of the Non-Subscribing Association,	30
POETRY—The Old Year and the New,	5
INTELLIGENCE,	32

MARCH.

What is Unitarian Christianity?	37
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	42
Remarks on Mr. Martineau's "Note or Two,"	51
Religion in its Outward and Sensible Manifestations,	57
The Mountains of Palestine,	63
POETRY—Hymn from the German,	50
INTELLIGENCE,	67—72

APRIL.

Religious Tracts and Irreligious Trash,	73
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	79
Biblical Criticism,	87
The Charge of "Shameless Forgery,"	92
Remonstrant Principles,	96
Letter of Mr. Robert M'Calmont,	97
POETRY—Trust is Best,	86
INTELLIGENCE,	101—105

MAY.

A Crisis in English Unitarianism,	109
British and Foreign Unitarian Association,	116
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	124
John the Baptist,	130
Ecce Homo,	134
Contemplated Changes in the Unitarian Association,	139
POETRY—The Great Worship,	115
INTELLIGENCE,	141, 142

JUNE.

A Fact and its Lessons,	145
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	149
Cottage Visiting and Tract Distributing,	157
The Temptation in the Wilderness,	164
POETRY—Different Paths,	157
INTELLIGENCE,	168—176

JULY.

Evangelical Christians,	181
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	186
Address of the Rev. Samuel Bache,	193
Review of the Recent Proceedings in the British and Foreign Unitarian Association,	204
The late Non-Subscribing Meetings,	209
POETRY—To a Child,	185
INTELLIGENCE,	210—216

AUGUST.

	PAGE
An Unsectarian Theology,	217
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	222
The Risen Saviour,	230
Whither are we Tending?	236
The First Miracle,	242
Poetry—The Holier Worship,	221
Correspondence,	245—249
Intelligence,	250—252

SEPTEMBER.

The New Catholic Movement,	253
Remarks on the Characteristic Style of the Apostle John,	261
Prayer in the Name of Christ,	265
The Cleansing of the Temple,	271
A New Phase of the Colenso Case,	274
A Scotch Professor on the Westminster Confession,	276
American Unitarian Association,	280
The General Baptist Churches,	282
Poetry—The Acceptable Sacrifice,	261
Intelligence,	284—287

OCTOBER.

Motives and Obstacles to Unitarian Missions,	289
The Future Life,	294
The Widow's Son at Nain,	303
A Definite Theology,	307
Christians and Deists,	318
Poetry—The Two Sunsets,	302
Reviews,	311—314
Correspondence—Editorial Exclusiveness,	321
Intelligence,	323

NOVEMBER.

Ought we to Pray to Christ?	325
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	332
The Future Life,	338
The Name Given at Antioch	350
Poetry—The Music of the Sea,	330
Review—The New Movement and the New Church, an Indication of Principles and a Proposal for a Name,	353
Intelligence,	355—358

DECEMBER.

Dogmas in the Primitive Church,	361
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	366
The Name Given at Antioch,	374
The Good Samaritan,	378
Philosophy and Religion,	385
Poetry—A Morning Hymn,	365
Review—Six Essays on Inspiration, Revealed Religion, and Miracles,	381
Intelligence,	387—392

JANUARY.

An Ordination on the "Absolute Liberty" Principle,	397
Congregational Memoirs—No. 5, Glenarm,	409
The Love of the Father in the Gift of the Son,	414
The Family at Bethany,	417
The Recent American Conference,	421
Poetry—My Boy,	407
Intelligence,	424—428

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] FEBRUARY, 1866. [No. 1.

WANTED—A NAME.

IN the discussions which have lately prevailed in the English Unitarian Church, an opinion has been frequently expressed that it is inconsistent to retain any sectarian name, while those to whom it is given disclaim all sectarianism, and profess themselves to be the unrestricted friends of Free Inquiry. It is quite true that, so far as we know, all who thus object to be called Unitarians do yet hold the doctrine of the existence of God in One Person, and therefore might justly retain the designation which they are impatient to cast off; but, as free inquirers, it is possible that they might arrive at the conclusion—to which inquiry of a particular kind has sometimes led—that there is really no God, either in Three Persons or in One; and then we are constrained to admit that to call them Unitarians would be to misrepresent their opinions and mislead the public. A tract society in some of the Midland Counties of England, which, till lately, rejoiced in the name of *Unitarian*, has dropped that sectarian title, and has voted itself to be "the Midland Christian Union;" and has declared its object to be "the promotion of Christianity, in connection with the freedom which rejects subscription to any articles of theological belief." It is difficult for ordinary minds to fathom the depths or measure the heights to which the religious inquirers of our age have reached, and therefore we should be very slow to criticise; but it does seem difficult to conceive of Christianity without some theological belief, if that should even extend no further than to a belief in a God. But we presume that this novel basis of the Midland Union aims at being so broad as to embrace within it the

numbers in the manufacturing districts of England, who, under the abused name of Unitarian, or the more consistent and honest designation of unbelievers, reject everything in the shape of Divine Revelation. To suppose that any Christians who are not Unitarians would connect themselves with such a society is utterly absurd.

But, according to a new meaning which has been given to the word "Unitarian," it might be found suitable to designate the free and comprehensive views of those who, in their efforts to improve the world, ignore all theological belief! *The London Inquirer*, when recently taken to task by the biographer of the Rev. F. W. Robertson, for having represented that eminent minister as a Unitarian, replied that "the attitude of his mind on the great questions of the religious life was substantially in accord with what is highest and best in Unitarianism. Robertson was eminently a *uniter* or reconciler."* Now, in this ingenious, or, as some may think, disingenuous, sense of the word "Unitarian," it may most appropriately be employed to designate those who, in their hatred of sectarianism and their love of "absolute freedom," seek to bring into one body, and unite in one religious brotherhood, all classes of the community, no matter how diverse their opinions, whether they believe in three Gods, in one God, or in no God. But when a particular meaning has for centuries been attached to any term, it is hardly possible to employ it otherwise; the suggestion of *The Inquirer*, that all are Unitarians who are "uniters" or "reconcilers," was only a weak attempt to get out of a difficulty; and we think that when men advance so far as to sink all theological belief, they are quite consistent in abandoning the Unitarian name.

We have observed a disposition on the part of many of our advanced thinkers to call themselves "Free Christians." There is some appropriateness in this name: they profess not to be bound by "creed, or tie, or anything." They claim the right to receive or reject any opinions which may be submitted to them, without regard to Church or to Bible. Whatever does not exactly tally with their own notions of what religion ought to be in its doctrines, precepts, promises, and warnings, they un-

* See *Inquirer* of Nov. 25, p. 751, col. 1.

scrupulously reject: they are therefore "free." There is a little awkwardness in taking the name of "Christian"; but perhaps they conceive that the qualifying term which is prefixed gets rid of any objection that might else be made to it. Certainly they are not open to the charge of inconsistency which rests upon their sympathizers—we do not say their fellow-believers—on this side of the channel, for they bind themselves to take the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as their rule of faith, and all the while cry up "absolute liberty"; they declare, almost in the same breath, that the basis of their Church is "the Scriptures our sole rule of faith," and that their bond of union is "fearless free inquiry," as if the authority of Scripture and fearless free inquiry were identical or even compatible.

But perhaps a more appropriate name for these dissatisfied Unitarians would be that of "Progressive Christians," which we have lately seen proposed. It helps to bring out distinctly one prominent idea which is conspicuous in their speeches and writings. "Forward" is their watchword: they regard with mingled pity and contempt those who rest in the revelation which God gave in Christ Jesus: and while they admit that Christianity, as embodied in the New Testament, has much in it that is very good, they believe that the philosophy of modern times has improved on it, that they have already reached to a purer religion than Jesus taught, and that by-and-bye they may arrive at something better still.

Possibly one of the names which we have noticed may be generally adopted by the class of Unitarians who object to every dogmatic and sectarian designation: if so, we would strongly recommend the last we have noticed; for, let them seek the aid of *The Inquirer* as they will to give its new definition to the word "Unitarian," it would still retain its dogmatic meaning; and "Free Christian" would not express the kind or extent of freedom which is meant, and might be supposed to refer to freedom from State control or ecclesiastical interference. We would recommend, therefore, that they should style themselves "Progressive Christians," did we not think that we could supply them with something still more suitable to the position they seek to assume. There

is a material commonly known as *German Silver*, now in extensive use; it has the appearance of the precious metal of which it bears the name, and by the inexperienced and ignorant it is often mistaken for it, but it possesses little intrinsic value. What relation it has to Germany we cannot tell, but the prefix sufficiently distinguishes it from the sterling article. Spread over England, and other Christian countries of Europe, there is a class of religionists known as *German Jews*. They do not hold the principles, nor do they observe the ritual, of that ancient and interesting people; perhaps they are descended from them, but they seem to have little of their religion but the name; and, therefore, to express the looseness of their principles and the spuriousness of their faith, they are called *German* Jews. Now, it occurs to us that these haters of authority and lovers of freedom might very fairly take the name of *German Christians*. From the neutralizing force which the word "German" has, by common consent, obtained as a prefix, there would be no more danger of the word Christian being misunderstood in such a connexion than Silver is when we talk of "German Silver;" and the name would thus afford them all the liberty that in conscience, or despite of conscience, they could desire, while there would, at the same time, be happily suggested the country from which our advanced thinkers have, till lately at least, derived most of their rationalistic notions.

After all, however, there is an awkwardness in the use of the word Christian in such a connexion. Christian signifies in some sense a believer in the Christ, and as those whom we have in our mind do not recognise any Christ—any anointed teacher or Saviour—it might be more convenient, and certainly more consistent, to get rid of the word altogether. While they scout the idea of any divinely-appointed master, they are always ready to admit their belief in Jesus of Nazareth, and not only in the reality of his existence, but also in his goodness and wisdom, and they signify their willingness to make him, to a certain extent, their guide and exemplar. While there is some inconsistency in their calling themselves disciples of Christ, when they do not believe in a Christ, they might very properly take the name of Jesus in whom they

do believe, and adopt the designation of *Jesuits*—a designation in which some may see even more meaning than we have suggested.

THE OLD YEAR AND THE NEW.

[ORIGINAL.]

Bury the broken outcast—
Deep is his grave, and wide,
For many a sorrow, many a sin,
Many a prize we failed to win,
Many a joy that might have been,
We bury by his side.
Cover them up, and make no moan—
Who shall be judge but God alone?

Bright was the dawning promise
Of him we have laid to rest;
Welcome we gave him, frank and free,
Promises fair of what should be,
Hopes that beckoned so cheerily.
And now, stark on his breast
They lie, to show how we fought the fight,
How shunned the wrong, and upheld the right!

Oh! let them not rise against us,
Let the grave keep its dead—
Erring and weak, and proud and vain,
Cowards for sorrow, fear, and pain,
Eager for earthly joy and gain,
Thus have our moments sped.
Bitter remorse and trembling shame—
These are the guerdons we can claim.

Oh! may our sorrow ripen
To fruitage, that shall not be
Bitter within, though fair to sight;—
Give us, O Lord, thy Spirit's light!
Give us the strength to walk aright!
And humbly follow thee.
So shall our faith shine bright and clear,
Bringing new strength for a glad New Year.

Not with the foolish virgins,
Cast thou our portion, Lord!
Keep us pure, as Thyself art pure!
Grant us the trust that shall endure,
The priceless armour staunch and sure,
The blessing of thy Word;—
That when thou comest, we may be,
Waiting with joy to welcome Thee.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.*

SUCCESSION OF MINISTERS.

1. 1622—1655 (?) William Fenton.
2. 1658—1662 (?) James Fleming.
3. 1662 ——. David Houston.
4. 1671—1685. John Anderson.
5. 1685—1688. Hugh Crawford.
6. 1688, 1689. John Darroch.
7. 1709 ——. James Creighton.
8. —— 1754. Thomas Brown.
9. 1756—1812. Thomas Read.
10. 1792—1799. Robert Acheson, *Assistant.*
11. 1801—1853. Alexander Montgomery.
12. 1836—1852. Thomas Smyth, *Assistant.*
13. 1852—1855. John Jellie.
14. 1855 ——. James Callwell.

From the foregoing list, it will be seen that our knowledge respecting the dates of the incumbencies of some

* This name properly belongs only to the town of Glenarm, which is situated on the N.E. coast of County Antrim, about twelve statute miles north of Larne. From the town, the name has been extended to two adjacent half-baronies, which are called respectively, Upper and Lower Glenarm. The name of the Parish in which the town of Glenarm is included, is Tickmacreevan; but, strictly speaking, "the modern benefice of Glenarm" (according to Dr. Reeves, *Eccles. Antiq.*, p. 51), "is an union of the Parishes of Tickmacreevan and Templecoughter, and each incumbent is under the necessity, ere his induction, of procuring an Act of Council to authorise the continuance of the union, although the boundaries between the two are so completely forgotten that no ingenuity could restore them. In consequence of this uncertainty, the Ordnance Survey was compelled to represent both under the single name Tickmacreevan." The town of Glenarm, which is now known principally as a picturesque watering place, and most agreeable summer residence, is said to have enjoyed, in former days, when Belfast was known only as a ford across the Lagan, the distinc-

of the earlier ministers of Glenarm is very imperfect. I fear it will also appear, as we go along, that our information on other points connected with the history of this Congregation, for the same period, is equally scanty. This arises from the lamentable want of contemporaneous local records. One thing, however, is very evident, that the stay of many of these ministers in Glenarm was exceedingly short. This was caused partly by their "want of encouragement there in the way of maintenance," and partly by the "troubles of the times," which induced no less than three of them, viz., Messrs. Anderson, Crawford, and Darroch, to leave Ireland altogether, and return to Scotland, where they accepted congregational charges, which they continued to occupy till their death.

The precise date of the introduction of Presbyterianism into the town and neighbourhood of Glenarm cannot now, I think, be accurately ascertained. On a list of a County Antrim Jury for 1613, which is given in the *Ulster Journal of Archæology* (Vol. i., p. 264), appear the names of "William Dure of Glinarme, gent," and "Andrew Hatton of Glinarme." These persons were, in all likelihood, Protestants of some Church or other; but whether they were Episcopalian or Presbyterian Protestants does not appear. Indeed, the earliest record in connexion with this district of country to which we seem to be at all warranted in assigning a Presbyterian character, is dated 1622; and therefore with this year we may begin the history of the Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm.

tion of a corporation, with corporate property and privileges. The designations, "East and West Libert," "Parisha," and "the College," which are still given to lands adjoining the town, seem to favour this idea, and to refer to "the liberties" of this ancient borough, and to "the commons" of its burgesses. I have even heard that within a comparatively recent period Commissioners of some sort were employed to make inquiries after the absorbed, or appropriated, property of this old Corporation of Glenarm, but I never understood that their investigations had any practical result; and I fear that the information which was then sought for is not now attainable. This is very much to be deplored, for I am sure it would be both interesting and important. Since the year 1750, Glenarm Castle, which is contiguous to the town of the same name, and which is beautifully situated at the foot of a most romantic glen, has been the residence of the Earls and Marquises of Antrim.

I.—William Fenton, M.A. (1622 to 1655.) In the Ulster Visitation Book for 1622 occurs the following entry respecting the parish with which we are now concerned :—"Tickmacreevan, or Glenarm; William Fenton, M.A., resident and serveth the Cure. Church decayed."* I am inclined to think that this Mr. Fenton, although his name appears on an Episcopalian record, was yet in reality a Presbyterian. Undoubtedly Messrs. Brice of Broadisland, Ridge of Antrim, and Cunningham of Holywood, whose names also appear on the same list, were Presbyterian ministers. At any rate, even if Mr. Fenton of Glenarm was not in 1622 an avowed Presbyterian, it is almost certain that he became one after the year 1641, for most of the Protestants who were then left in the North of Ireland were Presbyterians, and many of the clergy who had hitherto been Episcopalians then joined the Presbyterian Church. Of these, some afterwards went so far as to subscribe the Solemn League

* "The present Parish Church of Glenarm," says Dr. Reeves, "is quite a modern building, occupying part of the site of the Franciscan Abbey. It superseded an also comparatively modern church, which stood at the shore end of the town, at the other side of the river. The ancient churches in the union of Glenarm, were :—

"1.—*St. Patrick's*, or the old church of Tickmacreevan, which stood in the district called 'Glore,' where the present glebe is situated.

"2.—*St. Mary's*, or the old church of Templeoughter, which stood on a spot that is now enclosed in Glenarm demesne, and lies near the brink of a stream a little south of the castle, where some slight irregularity of the ground marks the traces of the foundations; and a small portion of the cemetery which is surrounded by a wall, is claimed as the burying place of one or two families. Out of the ruins of this old church of Templeoughter, a line of cabins, called "Beggar's Row," was built in the last century between the castle and the site of the church. About the year 1802, the interest of the occupants in these tenements was purchased, and their dwellings levelled.

"3.—In Bridge Street was an ancient chapel whose name is now unknown. The ruins of this chapel were removed some years ago to make way for the present school-house, which stands near the castle gate. Attached to this chapel was a burying-ground, which is now converted to other purposes, with the exception of a small space, which is still claimed by one family, and over which is one tombstone enclosed by rails.

"4.—*The Abbey*, which occupied the site of the present church. This abbey was founded in 1405, by Robert Bisset, for Franciscans of the third order, and in 1557 was granted, together with its lands, to Alexander M'Donnell. During the erection of the modern church, the ruins of the abbey were pulled down, and nothing of them is now remaining but some foundations in the present churchyard, which seem to have belonged to a cruciform building."—Reeves, *Eccles. Antiq.*, pp. 51, 87, 299.

and Covenant, when it was submitted for signature throughout the length and breadth of the Province of Ulster in 1644; and in the Route (a district in the north of County Antrim) a number of ministers who had acted in this way, *i.e.*, who had been at one time "Conformists," but who had afterwards taken the Covenant, formed themselves, in that year, into a new Presbytery, on the list of whose members appears the name of William Fenton, of Glenarm. So that I think we are entitled to claim this gentleman as a Presbyterian minister, and if so, he was the first Presbyterian minister of the congregation whose history I am now writing. In this capacity, his situation at Glenarm, in 1642, must have been one of singular difficulty and embarrassment. In that year (as I have stated more than once in previous papers) the Scottish Presbyterian ministers, who were attached as chaplains to the army of Major-General Robert Monro, constituted themselves, at Carrickfergus, into the first Presbytery which ever sat in Ireland, and, amongst other measures which they adopted for the enlargement of Presbyterianism in Ulster, sent out ministers of their Body to visit such places as were "first in a condition for eldership." On the list of places which were thus visited at that time, we find the Parishes of Larne and Cairncastle, which are in the immediate neighbourhood of Glenarm. But Glenarm itself is not mentioned as being included in the missionary tour of these military propagandists. It is, however, nearly certain that Monro's Presbyterian chaplains did visit Glenarm at this time; for Monro himself went there, attended by his entire army, and it is not likely that so good a Presbyterian as the Scottish general undoubtedly was, would leave his chaplains behind him in Carrickfergus. But the effect, if not the object, of their coming to Glenarm, was to bring not peace, but a sword. They also brought fire along with them, of which they made a most unscrupulous use. The Earl of Antrim was at that time in Glenarm, and had expressed a wish to be received by Monro into Carrickfergus; but that general, possessing, as he thought, abundant evidence of the Earl's insincerity and real enmity to the Protestant cause, determined to anticipate the visit. Accordingly, in June 1642,

he assembled his forces, and being joined by Sir John Clotworthy, of Antrim, and his regiment, set out from Carrickfergus to meet the Earl of Antrim at Glenarm. On his arrival in that town, he found that the wily nobleman whom he was anxious to see had just left for his more northern Castle of Dunluce; and as the Scottish forces appear to have met with some opposition or annoyance during their stay in Glenarm, they proceeded, according to the lax military morality of those days, to burn the town, and I believe every house in it was committed to the flames. This conduct on the part of Monro's army would not give the inhabitants of Glenarm a very favourable impression of their Presbyterian visitors, nor would it much incline them to lend an attentive ear to the services of Presbyterian chaplains whose immediate disciples had treated them so unmercifully, even although they did favour the same form of church government with their respected minister and fellow-townsman, Mr. Fenton.*

* After burning the town of Glenarm, Monro, reinforced by additional levies from Scotland, proceeded in pursuit of the Earl of Antrim to Dunluce, which he invested, and forced that nobleman to surrender himself and his castle into his hands. The Scotch general sent his noble prisoner to Carrickfergus, where he was duly lodged in the castle of that town, but it did not hold him long. The Earl of Antrim of those times was even more adroit in shortening the term of his confinement, than was a Fenian "Head Centre" of the present day. He was twice taken prisoner; was twice lodged in Carrickfergus Castle, and twice made his escape therefrom. On the first occasion, the one above alluded to, he was, after a detention of six months, liberated by the instrumentality of a faithful servant, called Stewart, who having obtained a pass for a sick man, carried his master in a bed to the shore, and got him boated for Carlisle, whence he went to York. On the second occasion, in 1643, having undergone an imprisonment of five months, he found means, through a Lieutenant George Gordon, who was an officer in one of the Scotch regiments in Carrickfergus garrison, but who was also married to the Earl's sister, Lady Rose M'Donnell, to effect his escape by letting himself down by ropes over the walls of the castle. A contemporary annalist thus quaintly describes this latter achievement:—"This Lieutenant Gordon craftily conveyed up, unespied, in his breeches certain tows (ropes) by the whilk the Earl escaped, and wan freely away; and the Lieutenant followed and fled also." I have heard a tradition—the particulars of which I have, of course, noted, but have not yet been able to verify—that within the memory of persons still living, the original commission, with the royal arms in wax attached thereto—from King Charles to the Earl of Antrim, authorising the latter to raise troops for the service of his Sovereign on his estates in this county—was seen in the Glens of Antrim.

The circumstances above-mentioned will also probably account for the fact that, in 1644, Glenarm is not mentioned amongst the places which in that year were visited by the Scotch Presbyterian ministers, who were sent over to administer the Solemn League and Covenant to the Presbyterians of Ulster. We have seen, indeed, that Mr. Fenton, the minister of Glenarm, had himself subscribed that document, but it does not appear that the Covenant was submitted for signature to the people of Glenarm. Still, the ministers who had been employed on this work in other districts were destined to become acquainted with inhabitants of Glenarm, and to make their acquaintance under rather disastrous circumstances. On their way home to Scotland, after having discharged the duty which they had been sent to Ireland to perform, these unfortunate ministers fell into the hands of Alaster M'Donnell, the noted Colkittagh, who was Major-General of his noble kinsman's (Lord Antrim's) forces, and who, with four vessels full of soldiers, happened to be proceeding at that time to Scotland, to the assistance of Montrose. Coll, "of the left hand," lodged his reverend prisoners in the Castle of Meagrie, in Scotland, where they were all put together into one chamber, and subjected to a long and severe confinement. The news of this capture by his kinsman, of a cargo of Presbyterian ministers, must have given the Earl of Antrim some satisfaction, when he remembered how, two years before, their fellow-religionists had burned his town of Glenarm.

For some years after this date I have not met with any record bearing upon the history of Presbyterianism in the town and neighbourhood of Glenarm. In 1651, nearly all the Presbyterian ministers who were then in Ireland were arrested by Colonel Venables, the Parliamentary general, and imprisoned in Carrickfergus, whence they were afterwards removed to Scotland. If Mr. Fenton was at that time minister of Glenarm, he must have endured this incarceration, for his name (unlike that of his neighbour, Mr. Patrick Adair, of Cairncastle) is not mentioned amongst the six or seven ministers who were at that trying period allowed to remain in their parishes and were not apprehended.

Two years afterwards, viz., in 1653, Cromwell con-

ceived the notable idea of getting rid of the Ulster Presbyterians altogether, by transporting them thence to Tipperary; and on the list for the Barony of Glenarm, of those who were to be thus removed, appear the names of Mr. Donnelson, James Donnelson, Randal Buttle, Capt. Lieut. James Hume, and James Fenton. These gentlemen were undoubtedly Glenarm Presbyterians, and therefore I shall put into a foot note some information which I have been able to collect respecting them, especially respecting the Donnelson family, who, though now decayed and extinct, were for many years the generous patrons of the Glenarm Congregation.*

Shortly after the conception and failure of this transportation scheme, the ministry of Mr. Fenton in Glenarm, and probably also his life, appears to have terminated. The date of his decease, or demission, seems to have been 1654; for, in a small volume of Minutes of the Antrim Meeting, which extends from October 1654, till May 1658, and which is quoted in Reid's *History of the Presbyterian Church* (ii. 290), it is stated that in 1655 the Congregation of Glenarm was vacant.

* The Donnelson family occupied for many years a very high social position in the town and neighbourhood of Glenarm. One of their castles, called "Donnelson's Castle," stood at the head of the Main Street of the town, where its ruined remains have been seen by persons still living, but are now no longer visible. Another of their castles, situated rather more than a mile to the north of the town, was on the farm which is now occupied by Mr. Martin, of the Bay, and where traces of it may still be recognised in the walls of one of the farm buildings. Drumnasole, a little farther down the shore—which is now the property and residence of the Turnly family, was, in like manner, part of the large estates of the Donnelsons, of Glenarm, as were also the Largy, Cariff, and other mountain districts in that neighbourhood. On the other side of Glenarm, a member of this once powerful family, who was, I believe, connected by marriage with the Shaws of Ballygally, owned a part of the north end of Cairncastle, in connection with which tradition states that at one time this Mr. Donnelson made great preparations for building a splendid mansion there, and got the length of excavating the capacious wine cellars, when, either from superabundance of wine, or deficiency of cash, the work was stopped, and never proceeded further. Not very many years ago, traces were to be seen in Ballygilbert of this spot,

"Where once the garden smiled,
And still where many a garden flower grows wild."

So early as the years 1633 and 1656, John Donnelson, of Glenarm, was High-Sheriff of County Antrim; and so late as 1740, a rent paper connected with Lord Antrim's estates speaks of Mr. John Donnelson as having a holding in fee worth £250 a year; Madam Donnelson, £100 a

THE "BETHS" OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON.

In the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament we frequently meet with words, and parts of words, to which at first we may be unable to attach a meaning. We cannot understand what we read, unless some one will come and guide us, and whilst we are thus ignorant, we miss much of the interest and much of the profit that we should gain were the case otherwise. Scripture names —those of places and those of persons—appear strange to us. Some cannot read them at all, others make sad work of their pronounciation, whilst very few imagine these names have any signification in themselves, or they care nothing for their meaning; yet there is not a single name in the Bible but has a meaning attached to it, and in many instances a very important meaning. Men re-

year, and Sanders Donnelson, £100 a year. The aggregate of these sums was in those days no despicable rental. But of all these lands and castles not a rood nor a stone is now owned by a Donnelson. Indeed, it may be said that the family, as well as the estate, is gone. Some of the property was purchased by the late Mr. William Agnew, of Kilwaughter—"the Old Squire." Some fell into the hands of Mr. Turnly, and I have heard that when this latter gentleman was building the present house of Drumnasole, a member of the ancient family of Donnelson was working as a day labourer on what had once been a part of the estate of his ancestors. To the credit of Mr. Turnly's memory, it should be added, that so soon as he was informed of the circumstance, he treated the fallen man with marked kindness, and at once made him landsteward of Drumnasole. The last lineal male representative of the Donnelsons, of Glenarm, lived latterly, I believe, in the County Down, where he died some years ago, unmarried. He was dumb, and somewhat eccentric, but always maintained the suitable deportment of a gentleman. On his death, his sister, who had married the late Rev. Mr. Clewlow, became the head of this ancient family, and she is now also dead. The Donnelsons, of Glenarm, were always Presbyterians, and it will be seen, during the course of our narrative, that on all occasions connected with the Presbyterian congregation of that town they were treated with becoming deference and respect.

Randal Buttle, in 1637, got a fee-farm grant from the Earl of Antrim of certain lands and tenements in Glenarm and Cairncastle, as already described in a note to the memoir of the latter congregation. This family is also now locally extinct.

Of Capt. Lieut. James Hume, I can say nothing, except to surmise that he may have been an ancestor of a Mr. Wm. Hume, of Glenarm, who upwards of one hundred years ago was educated for the church, but never took holy orders, and taught a most respectable classical school in Glenarm.

James Fenton was probably a son, or other relative, of Mr. W. Fenton, the first Presbyterian minister of Glenarm.

ceived their names from memorable things connected with their birth or their parents, or other matters in which they or their friends were interested; and places were called from their situations, or from the memorable persons who first brought them into notice; and the prefixes, or the beginning of words, are well worthy of our attention. Thus, the first syllable, *ab*, always means *father*, as Abraham, the father of nations. *Bar* means son, as *Bar*jona, the son of Jona; and *Beth*, of which I now mean to speak, means a house, as *Beth*el, the House of God, first applied to a single house, and from thence, as is common in all languages, coming to mean a collection of houses—whether many or few—a city, or a small village, and even a place which had no houses. In the Old Testament we find this prefix applied to many towns and places, and always with a meaning, such as Bethaven, the city of idols,—a place no doubt notorious for idolatry. —Bethoven, Bethcar, Bethshan, &c. But it is of the Beths of the New Testament that I wish particularly to speak now, both because you read the New Testament more frequently, and because we are naturally the most interested in all that relates to the history of our Lord and his Apostles. Your own recollections will bring before you Bethlehem, and Bethany, and Bethesda, and I am persuaded you will like to know something of these places, with others thus styled the houses of such and such matters. Give me, then, your attention for a short time whilst I endeavour to describe them for your edification.

The first in order, as well as the first in fame, is Bethlehem, meaning the House of Bread. It must be noticed that there were two towns of this name,—the one in Zebulun, included in the more modern Galilee, the other in Judah or Judea, a few miles south of Jerusalem, and sometimes called Bethlehem-Judah, and at others Bethlehem-Ephrata. It is of the latter, the Judean Bethlehem, that I purpose to speak. It stood in the midst of a very fruitful country, abounding with corn and fruits, and therefore might well be called the house or city of bread, as well as *Ephrata*. The fruitful Bethlehem was the place where Jacob led his flocks to pasture, and in its beautiful fields Boaz blessed his reapers whilst Ruth gleaned in them, and from them was taken to be the wife

of Boaz himself. It is further distinguished to us as the City of David, for here was born the Shepherd King—the sweet Psalmist of Israel,—here he watched his father's flock, here he was anointed by the Prophet Samuel as the future king of Israel, and here he doubtless wrote some of his beautiful Psalms, especially those in which such touching allusions are made to the pastoral life, to God being the Shepherd, and we the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand; and all this would have been sufficient to have made Bethlehem most interesting and most dear to us. But it becomes a hundredfold more interesting and more dear when we think of it as the birth-place of the Saviour of the world, of him whose name is Jesus, because he saves us from our sins. Here was he born in a manger, because there was no room for him in the inn; whilst in the fields near, shepherds kept watching their flocks at night, and suddenly heard the voices of the heavenly host singing—"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and good will to men." It does not appear that our Lord visited Bethlehem during the course of his ministry. We know that his labours were much in Galilee, and perhaps not at all south of Jerusalem. Still, the place of his birth has ever had great attractions for Christian believers. In very early times buildings were erected on and near the spots where the Saviour and his mother had been. A fine church was raised by a Roman Empress; and at this day the grotto of the nativity is shewn splendidly lit up and magnificently furnished. Far rather would we see it in a state as near as possible to that which it presented on the morning when the wise men and the humble shepherds came to offer their gifts; but that cannot now be. The beautiful hills and valleys round Bethlehem remain: they are still covered over with corn, and they rejoice and sing. We rejoice with them, for the Lord hath visited his people, and hath raised up to us a mighty salvation.

Nearer yet to Jerusalem is the Mount of Olives, from which Jesus pronounced the destruction of that proud unbelieving city, and from which he ascended into heaven. On the eastern side of this mount are Bethany and Bethphage, Bethany lying to the north of the other

village. Bethany means the *house of dates*, because it may be supposed that a number of date trees grew there. The date is a very useful tree, and its fruit is much prized by the people of the East. Bethany was but a small place. To us it is of importance on account of our Lord having so often made it his temporary abode, in the beloved family of Lazarus, with his sisters Martha and Mary. Lazarus died at Bethany; and it was in the graveyard of the village that our Saviour stood, and called him to life again—"Lazarus, come forth;" and Lazarus obeyed his voice, as we all must obey his voice at the last day, when he will call each one to be judged for the deeds done in the body. It was at Bethany that Martha made Jesus a feast, whilst Mary sat at his feet and heard his word. Martha was a good and kind woman, but she was over-anxious about worldly matters. Mary chose the good part, which was the one thing needful. At Bethany, also, Mary anointed the head of her Lord with the precious ointment; and near Bethany, whilst talking with his disciples, a cloud received him out of their sight,—he ascended to heaven to sit for ever at the right hand of the throne of God.

Bethphage means the *house of figs*. It was a larger place than Bethany; but we read but little of it in the Gospels. It was to Bethphage that Jesus sent two of his disciples for the ass's colt, on which he was to ride into Jerusalem. Perhaps some of his followers lived here. It is somewhat remarkable, that whilst Bethany yet exists, though a very mean place, Bethphage is quite gone; hardly a trace of it remains.

We now come to Bethsaida, which means the *house of fish*, because near the Lake of Galilee, in which was abundance of fish. Bethsaida was probably the chief town on the lake, where fish were brought for sale. It was some miles south of Capernaum, and it was the residence, and most likely the birthplace, of three of our Lord's apostles—viz., Peter, Andrew, and Philip; whilst at Bethsaida, as well as in many other towns of Galilee, Jesus did many of his wonderful works—gave sight to the blind, and healed numbers who were sick. There was another Bethsaida, also in Galilee, and more to the north. This was sometimes called Julias, after Julia, a

Roman princess; but not so in the Gospels, where it has usually the name of *Chorazin*. You will recollect that our Lord said—"Woe unto thee, Chorazin; woe unto thee, Bethsaida," on account of the unbelief of the people of these towns. They had listened to his words, and they had seen his miracles, which testified that God had sent him, but their hearts were hardened by sin; they despised and rejected him, and thus they filled up the measure of their iniquity. It was near Chorazin, or Bethsaida, that our Saviour fed five thousand people with five barley loaves and two small fishes, yet all ate and were filled, and twelve baskets were filled with what remained. May we gather up the fragments, that nothing be lost.

Bethabara means the *house of passage*, and, as the name shews, it was built near one of the fords or passages of the Jordan. Here John baptized; and probably Jesus was baptized at Bethabara. Hither Jesus retired after he had excited the rage of the Jews by his discourse at the feast of Dedication.

Bethesda signifies the *house of mercy*. The only mention of this place, or rather building, is in the fifth chapter of John's Gospel, verse 2, where it is said, "Now there is at Jerusalem, by the sheep-market, a pool which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches." This place was built for the accommodation of the impotent folk, the blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water; and, as the water was of a healthy kind, the place of waiting might well be called the Bethesda, or the House of Mercy. Here Jesus healed the poor man who for nearly forty years had suffered from a very painful disease. The word was spoken, and the cure was at once effected. No man could do the miracles he did unless God were with him. To us he is "the power of God and the wisdom of God."

So you perceive the *Beths* are places to us of great interest; whatever relates to the history of our blessed Redeemer must be to us of great value. Only let us endeavour to comprehend the meaning, for whatever was written aforetime was written for our learning.

B.

"THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION."

COULD THE VERDICT OF EQUITY BE GIVEN IN THE PRESENT CRISIS FOR THE ALTERED FOUNDATIONS OF ITS PRINCIPLES?

[The following letter, from an English correspondent, was sent for publication to *The London Inquirer* some months ago, but was refused by the Editor of that journal, on the plea that he desired to close the discussion of the question. The question, however, is still discussed in its columns, and is likely to be so for months to come.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

Sir,—If I mistake not, the controversy originated in the idea that had from several writers gone forth that the foundation, the boundary lines, of the society required "enlargement"—alteration—an alteration which many of us—I know not the relative proportions—consider as at least tending to the subversion of all that renders it most worthy our support, and as incontestably diverse from the opinions of the founders. Before I proceed I must enter my protest against the invidious application of the designation, "Exclusive and Inclusive." *All* establishments rest on *some* basis—are destined for *some* objects—and are intended to be open only to those who are willing to come in on that basis, and who are in general accordance with those avowed objects. These societies are necessarily *exclusive* of all who could not act with them, and who would disturb or impede their operations. But who would for one moment think of raising the cry of "exclusive" invidiously against them? And is it only in religious action that a fundamental accordance of principle is not needed?

It may in some cases be, that the basis of a society may not be so strictly defined, but that in process of time the congregate numbers may find themselves standing on a somewhat different ground from that on which such society started, as with our Presbyterian trusts, in which the founders *could* not, if they had so willed it, have legally tied up the property to Unitarian purposes, and in which whole congregations found themselves either definitely Unitarian or Trinitarian. There was, we conceive, the nearest approximation to absolute justice, in suffering large majorities of such Presbyterian congregations to

carry the trusts for the promulgation of that faith which was truth to them. But this is surely no parallel to the position of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association! We *do* know what the opinions of *its* founders were, for they were free to avow them. We *do* know that they formed themselves into a society, that they might the better promulgate Unitarian *Christianity* as proclaimed in the Gospels; and we believe that there is ample strength left, of those who accord with the original principles of the Association, to carry out its ministrations—of those who, with Lindsey, Priestley, Toulmin, Belsham, Carpenter, Aspland, &c., hold most dear the affirmation of Jesus to Peter's warm-hearted declaration of faith—his creed it might now be called—"Thou art *the Christ* the son of the living God," to which Jesus replied—"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven;"—who believe that when Jesus answered, "I am," to the question, "Art thou *the Christ*, the son of the blessed?" he spoke that which he knew to be the truth;—whose hearts freely respond to the avowal of the Jewish Ruler, "We know that thou art a teacher sent from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou doest except God be with him;"—and who can only in their heart's truthfulness, "build upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." And are these the men who, from conscientious allegiance to Christ, are to be *ex*cluded—call it self-excluded if you will—that others may be *in*cluded by alteration of the society's basis? Could *any* majority render such proceedings just? Would it not be far more in accordance with *the right*, that those who think they have found out some more excellent way than belief in Christ as the heaven-attested "light of the world," should found for themselves a new society, leaving the old to unfettered action, with its old unaltered signification of "Christian."

It is intimated, or asserted, that Mr. Bache wishes to gird round and narrow the British and Foreign Unitarian Association with new and defined Creeds. If he does, we are in this in no sympathy with him—we walk not with him. We are amply content, and we think that he is too, with the simple creeds of Scripture.

I know that Unitarians are sensitive on this question of Creeds, and they have reason to be so, for they have suffered enough from such human impositions. But is *every* belief to be called, in any obnoxious sense, *a creed?* Belief, for instance, in God, in eternity, in Jesus as *the Christ*, in the Scripture sense. Further than this, we conceive, Mr. Bache scarcely wishes to go, and, as we understand, asks nothing but the security which the old unaltered Association till recently was conceived to give, and designations which shall be understood according to their established usage in the English language. If words, and ordinary English acceptations, are to be otherwise appropriated, then, indeed, it must needs be that phraseology must be altered, or attended with explanations to meet the newly-made obscurity. But we think we may reasonably ask, How can a Christian's contributions for the support of Christian institutions be rightly administered but by believing Christians? Contributors *should* know whether belief in the Christianity of the Gospels is to be built up in our churches at home and abroad, or whether faith in the *precepts* only of Jesus, or an undefined belief in the good and the true of some other prophet is to suffice, before they commit themselves to the responsibility of contributing their aid. And what, in all consistency, do those who suggest the idea of the enlargement of the Society's boundary line propose? What is their inclusiveness to include? If we take Theodore Parker's wide-reaching circle, it may include those who "may have lived a thousand years before Christ, or who, living now, have never heard his name;" for to these he would concede the name of Christian—aye, to Jews, Mahometans, and Heathens, and Deists, and Atheists,—to all who have any brotherhood in the philanthropy of Jesus. And would it not include the Protestant Trinitarian too, of all denominations? For he *has* the precepts of the Saviour, and often, also, lays claim to the name Unitarian. The Catholic, too, *has* the Gospel precepts, and what right have we to act the exclusive towards him? These all may join in doing good to men, in, if I may so express myself, the physical benignity of Jesus.

But if our Society is to expunge its old and hitherto

honoured *Unitarian* Christian faith from its rules, where is our security that some of these sects will not one day or other outvote us, and establish their own? Nay, will it not be consistency in them to do so? And where, in this theoretical, non-exclusive Society, can be its practical working? Can "Christianity" and "Unitarianism," with their novel definitions, under the all-embracing, non-exclusive scheme, find any harmonious sphere for action? Surely, as a religious body, there can be none in which such varying elements can work in concord. Those who may be "advanced" as far as Deism or Atheism, cannot consistently give their voice, and vote gifts for churches in which Jesus is to be preached as "the Christ." Thus, the effort for combined action, under this "*non-credo*" system, may become a sorer conscience trammel than any creed. We are each and all fallible, but let us each and all, with perfect respect for every conscientious difference of opinion, strive to put no injustice on each other, and so to act that we may best hold fast our integrity. We would not that our Association should interfere with any man's negations; but let not a basis of negations chill and cramp our action. Have we not a claim to ask freedom and room for generous warmth and sympathy to support and promote the faith which is precious to us, as well as freedom to decline adhesion to it? We who do believe that Jesus "spoke the words of the Father who sent him," and sealed those words—the Truth—with his blood, should be unworthy of our trust, if we could consent to be a party to any portion of that truth being treated as of small value.—Yours sincerely,

JUSTITIA.

CHRISTIANITY A DIVINE GIFT, NOT A HUMAN ACHIEVEMENT.*

"Be still, and know that I am God."—PSALM xlvi. 10.

THE Christians of modern Europe are the children and descendants, in matters intellectual and spiritual, of a very varied ancestry; but, as was pointed out recently

* A sermon preached in the Church of the Messiah, Birmingham, December 17, 1865, by the Rev. H. Enfield Dowson.

by one of the greatest of our living statesmen,† in his eloquent address to the students of the University of Edinburgh, *two* of the peoples of antiquity are in an eminent degree the forefathers of our thought and life. The Greeks and Jews—although the former are now a degraded and powerless nation, and the latter a people scattered to every quarter of the globe—although from both their pride and glory have long since departed, yet influence us in daily life, teach us and guide us, educate our minds and inspire our souls.

It is not out of mere caprice that at school we were taught the language of Homer and of Xenophon, nor is it from a superstitious reverence that the Bible was given us in childhood as a Holy Book. The lessons we learned from Greek and Jew were but a foretaste of the influence of both upon our lives. Whether wittingly or not, every English Christian now breathes an atmosphere of knowledge and of faith, of truth and of goodness, which are the noonday light of that early morning glow.

But whilst acknowledging ourselves in an especial manner the heirs of these two great races, we can, I think, also distinguish clearly the nature of the respective patrimonies which we have inherited from each. I think we can draw a very true and broad distinction between the influence upon the world exerted by the Greek, and that exerted by the Jew. The one is mainly intellectual and æsthetic, the other is mainly moral and spiritual. By the Greek we are aided in the search of truth, and led to worship at the shrine of beauty: by the Jew we are guided in the path of duty, and humbled before the throne of God. The Greek is the father of the natural man, the Jew is the father of the spiritual man. When the mantle of the Greek falls upon us, the man arises from within, and issues in the search of the beautiful and true in all the universe, and strives to wing his flight aloft until he shares the universal harmony: when the spirit of the Jew inspires us, as men we do but cry unto the Lord Jehovah, "O Lord, what is man that Thou art mindful of him?" Like Jacob in the wilderness, we ask, "Tell me Thy name, O Lord;" and like the Psalmist, we hear the

† The Right Honourable W. Ewart Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

answering voice of the high and lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, "Be still, and know that I am God." The ascent of the human is our heritage from the Greek, the descent of the Divine is our inheritance from the Jew.

If the ascent of the human had been all-sufficient to produce a divine humanity, no place would have been left for our Jewish ancestors to fill. If the natural man by seeking could have found out God, the Greeks might have led us into the presence-chamber of the Lord. But in the metropolis of Grecian thought and Grecian art, in Athens where Socrates, the greatest of the philosophers of Greece, had lived and died, the Christian Apostle found an altar "to the Unknown God." The Greeks had sought in vain; their minds had soared aloft on wings of thought in search of God, but the inscription on the altar declared their failure. To the ascent of the human there is a limit. When the natural man has learned the lessons of the universe, he has reached the limit. God says unto him, "Thus far canst thou go and no further." But where the Greek leaves us helpless, there the Jew takes us up. From the Jew we learn that God descends and speaks the word, men cannot ascend to read. It is of little consequence to us if the Pentateuch be, to some extent, unhistorical: it matters less whether Moses were its author. It may be that throughout the whole Old Testament, there is much fiction mingled with the facts. But what of that? There is nothing specially divine in the nature of many of the events narrated in its books. It is not as history that it is specially valuable at all. It is solely as an interpretation of history and of life that it possesses special value; and that interpretation is true though the events be unhistorical. Though no Adam and Eve ever walked beneath the trees of Eden, the Bible word still teaches us that God sees through the thickest shade, and in every hiding-place His voice is speaking to His children. Though no Jacob ever wandered in the wilderness alone, the word remains as true that God's Spirit wrestles with the souls of men. Though no Jewish nation had ever existed on the earth, the truth remains unshaken that a nation is a people of God, who rules it righteously. The special history of the peculiar people is of no more importance to the teaching of the Old Testa-

ment, than is the fortuitous example to the principle exemplified.

In the Old Testament we learn that the tabernacle of God is with men; that God looks down from heaven His dwelling-place; that God's voice speaks unto mankind, "Be still and know that I am God;" and having learned this, we have learned the word of God which it contains.

But from the New Testament we learn it more abundantly. The voice of God is heard throughout the Old Testament habitations of men. In the New Testament it becomes a living voice, and speaketh through his Son. Christ is the fulfilling of the dim visions of the Old Testament: Christianity is their perfect and concrete, or complete personal embodiment in Christ, the Emmanuel of all mankind. In the life of Christ we have humanity rendered divine, not by the ascent of the soul of man, but by the descent of the Spirit of God. Christianity is thus the religion, not of man ascending to find out God, but of God descending to inspire man. If Christ were divine, it was because, and only because, God's Spirit dwelt within Him; and if the human race is ever to arise and go unto their Father, it must be by His abiding through Christ in their souls. And this is the great truth contained in that doctrine of the Incarnation from which we dissent. Our orthodox fellow-christians clasp therein the very essence of Christianity, nay of religion. This essence is by their doctrine expressed in the concrete; that is, in the recognition of the entire Deity as embodied in Christ; and when they say we reject Christ, it is because, except in the concrete, that is in His complete personality, they cannot conceive of a belief that God was in Christ. But in holding their doctrine of the Incarnation, they hold, I repeat, the essence of the Christian religion: it is the concrete form in which they hold it that alone is false. And we need to beware lest, in releasing the Spirit from the form, we lose both together. We have need to beware lest, with the concrete incarnation, we reject the spiritual incarnation of God in Christ; for in rejecting this, we cast ourselves adrift from the central fact of Christianity, that God descended on the soul of Christ, and that Christ opened its door to give admission to this Holy Spirit: that Christ was divine because God came in and abode

with Him: that Christ knew the Father because he listened to the heavenly voice that said, "Be still and know that I am God."

Why was it that Christ was the perfect image of the Father, his life absolutely divine, his knowledge of God complete? Because he, the man, was perfectly still; because the human in his soul made no ascent, but awaited the descent of the Spirit from on high; because Christ's life was submission of the natural man unto the Spirit; because his inspiring prayer was, "Thy will, not mine, be done;" Thy Spirit, Thy power, Thy holiness, not mine, abide with me; because in Christ the human was no where, the divine everywhere; the human extinguished, the divine glorified. This surely is the meaning of his oft-repeated words, "Of myself I can do nothing; the words that I speak, I speak not of myself: the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works."

My brethren, the Spirit of God in Christ is the Alpha and Omega of his life. Christianity without the spiritual incarnation is no Christianity at all. Christianity that substitutes the ascent of the human for the descent of the Divine, inverts the order of God's revelation, whether unto Christ or to his disciples.

Christianity teaches us not only to know God in Christ, but also *how* to obtain this knowledge most abundantly; it provides not only spiritual food for our souls in its divine revelation, but it shows us the atttiude of soul in which we can best receive it. If, like Christ, we would become divine, like Christ we must be still, that we may know our God. The less of human thought and human theory there is ascending from within, the truer will be our heavenly knowledge, and the more divine our life. The more still man is, the clearer and more pure is God's voice within his soul.

I do not think that I am wrong in saying, that we Unitarians have need to beware lest we forget this great central fact of Christianity—that God is everything and man is nothing—God the teacher, the inspirer of Master and disciples alike, and Master and disciples alike of themselves able to know nothing of the things that are divine. I have heard it said, and indeed have often thought, that we occupy a very remarkable, if not un-

accountable, position in the Christian world to-day. We find that, in all the orthodox divisions of the Church, the rational views held by us and our forefathers are meeting every day with readier acceptance. We nevertheless do not grow, or our growth is very slow. My belief is, that this is accounted for, not by our faith being too true and too pure to be generally appreciated, but by our too prevalent inversion of God's order of revelation. I think that the mantle of the Greek has enveloped us at times so closely as to extinguish the spirit of the Jew. I think that the natural man has essayed too frequently to walk alone without the guidance of God's finger. I think that, in our midst, the human has too often been toiling to ascend, rather than awaiting the descent of the divine. I think, my brethren, that our freedom has been a stumbling-block, and that we have not altogether escaped the danger of putting our human theories in the place of God's verities. I think that we have preached ourselves, and not Christ Jesus the Lord. Of this I am sure, that if, with our rational belief in Christ, the revealer of God's truth to men, we go forth to speak as his disciples, with a message from God and not ourselves, there is a glorious work in store for our free churches. That the Christianity of God may be their religion from generation to generation, and that they may prosper in every good word and work, as it is, I know, our fervent prayer, so may it likewise be our earnest aim. Amen.

A NOTE OR TWO ON REV. J. S. PORTER'S REPLY.

THE main issue between Mr. J. S. Porter and myself is a very simple one. He puts one meaning, I put another, on certain statements made by Messrs. John Porter, S. C. Nelson, D. Maginnis, and J. Worthington. As these ministers must know what they meant better than either of us, the decision must rest with them. I am authorised by each of them to report that I have taken his words in their true sense.

Mr. John Porter says (uninvited by me), "Your letter I read, and it correctly expresses my sentiments."

Mr. Nelson: "You rightly, naturally, and reasonably

explain my words, as any unprejudiced reader would do."

Mr. Maginnis: "You have quite correctly interpreted my meaning; Mr. Scott Porter has utterly misrepresented it."

Mr. Worthington explains, that *The Inquirer's* report of his extemporary address at Bolton was copied from a local paper, and is, in his belief, less correct than that in the *Unitarian Herald*, made by that paper's usual reporter, and looked over by one of the senior editors who was present. Here the words are thus given: "Still more do I thank you for the very kind welcome given me as a minister of the Church of Jesus Christ, unfettered by creed, by tie, or anything of the kind,—a church which holds its members among the good and true of all ages." Mr. Worthington adds, "Accepting this report as correct, Mr. Porter himself will, I think, be disposed to modify his harsh language, and to believe that I by no means sought to assert that 'Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church;' but rather that, in its Catholicity, the church of which our Master is the head 'needs no verbal fetters of inflexible definition,' and will not even refuse communion to those 'good and true of every age,' who could not be *followers* of Christ, because they knew him not, but in whom the Spirit of the Father was made richly manifest, and who have acted up to the highest light granted to their day and generation."

Here I might stop. But, to leave no ground of complaint, I ought perhaps to notice one point more. Mr. J. S. Porter accuses me of "altering the terms of my challenge," because, in re-stating the opinion to which it referred, I introduced some explanatory words.

This comes of B. offering to answer a question put to A. When, in August, I asked Mr. Ham to verify a statement several columns long, it was sufficient for me compendiously to refer to it, setting down the bare thesis without the exposition, for the whole topic was fresh in his mind. But when, in November, Mr. J. S. Porter, in evident forgetfulness of what had been said on either side, stepped into Mr. Ham's place, it was necessary, for the prevention of ambiguities, that I should explicitly re-state the charge which had been made, and which I

undertook to rebut. If, in doing so, I have introduced *anything which Mr. Ham did not impute*, I am justly liable to rebuke. But if I have only defined, in his sense and my own, the opinion which he treated as real and I as imaginary, I have made no change except of the vague and forgotten into the precise and clear.

Now, the opinion charged by Mr. Ham I had stated thus: "That the proper basis of the Christian Church (*universally*) is 'Free Inquiry' or 'Religious Liberty,' *so that the ends of Christian fellowship are perfectly satisfied by any association of people, however heterogeneous in faith and policy, who agree to let each other's religion alone.*"

The question is, whether the words in italics correctly present the opinion imputed and contested by Mr. Ham. In *The Inquirer* of July 22, 1865, he develops the contents of that opinion. Its advocates, he assumes, want an association on the principle of "mere freedom," which would include "divergent and conflicting beliefs," "Judaism, Mahommedanism, pure Theism, negative Atheism," and whose "unity would signify the comprehension of *all free people*, whether they have any religion or not." Against this opinion he contends—superfluously, unless somebody holds it—that such an association "of all free people" could never satisfy the ends of Christian fellowship. I am not aware of any word of mine, in the sentence quoted, which does not fit Mr. Ham's *bête noire*.

The opinion thus imputed, that the Church should be an association, not of men *quâ* religious, but of men *quâ* free, is no more exemplified by Mr. J. S. Porter's new instances than by his old. Nor even do the extreme writers, Mr. Coupland and Mr. Davison, set aside the paramount objects of a church—worship and a religious life—in favour of an intellectual end—"Free Inquiry." On the contrary, they give them so dominant a place, and believe them to meet with such a deep consent from the hearts of all men, as to reduce the widest intellectual differences to insignificance, and fuse into one spiritual whole elements logically incongruous. They think it possible, under an open system, that avowed Christians and avowed non-Christians should find a common nurture for their religious life beneath the same ecclesiastical

roof. From this opinion I strongly dissent. With Mr. Tayler and Dr. Barham I rest in a more limited and practicable hope, viz., of a sanctuary which shall be adequate, in the long run, to all *Christian* wants, and shall permit, *in succession*, beliefs which, even within this limit, are too little compatible to worship *together*. Nevertheless, differing as I do from these writers, I can neither allow that their opinion is what Mr. J. S. Porter undertook to produce, nor accept his approved remedy for their error—viz., *a verbal test*. They think that, if let alone, they can create and work a church including all the faiths and philosophies of mankind. I am content to say—*Let them try*. The combinations and separations of religious sympathy will settle themselves without our words. If people cannot unite, they will not unite, and our precautions are superfluous; and if they can, who would wish to keep asunder those whom the quest of God has brought together? In every chimerical aim, however, there is a waste of time and strength; and, leaving these large ambitions to men who can afford to lavish both, I am satisfied with a smaller and nearer hope—of seeing the liberal Christian churches—those which have no "salvation by orthodoxy"—clear themselves of dogmatic definitions and names, and, as a communion united among themselves and open to all, become "unconditionally devoted to the pure Christian pieties and charities."

JAMES MARTINEAU.

[In reference to the article by the Rev. J. Scott Porter, published in our last number, and in reply to which the foregoing rejoinder appears from the pen of the Rev. J. Martineau, we have received two notes, one from the Rev. J. Page Hopps, and the other from Mr. Robert M'Calmont. Mr. Hopps writes to say, that "the earnest and conscientious man who asked Mr. Martineau for a definition of Unitarianism, that he might know whether he could continue in a Unitarian Association," was not Mr. Clayden, but Mr. Bache; and that he adheres to the statement objected to by Mr. Porter—viz., "that the search for truth knows no bounds in nature, and should bring no disqualifications in the Church." Mr. M'Calmont says—"It is a rule, recognised in all educated and gentlemanly society, that when a statement or opinion is imputed to another who denies

its truth, the party so offending at once withdraws the imputation and apologises for his indiscretion or mistake. Mr. John Scott Porter is evidently forgetful of this established and salutary rule; for, in his reply to Mr. Martineau's criticism in the last number of *The Christian Unitarian*, he has again attributed to me statements in connexion with a reported conversation with the late Mr. Scott, of Girvan, which I have already distinctly and publicly repudiated."

We beg to inform Mr. M'Calmont that he misapprehends the recognised rules of educated and gentlemanly society. If any one deliberately makes a statement in the presence of respectable parties who are willing to testify to it, he cannot get rid of it by a simple denial. He may, if he thinks right, withdraw it, and express regret for having given utterance to it, and in that case it should not again be referred to: but merely to deny it, is indirectly to impute falsehood to those who have declared that he made the statement. We ask Mr. M'Calmont to turn to *The Christian Unitarian*, Vol. ii., p. 317—321, and he will see evidence strong enough to convince any unprejudiced party that he really expressed the opinions which Mr. Porter attributes to him. Several trustworthy persons still living heard him do so, and have given their testimony to that effect; and the report of the matter as contained in the letters of Mr. Scott—one to the Rev. Dr. Beard, and the other to the Rev. John A. Crozier—is so distinct and minute, that to question its accuracy would be to cast an imputation on the veracity of one whose memory all who knew him revere, as that of an earnest, truthful, and Christian man. If Mr. M'Calmont has changed his ideas of a church, and is now disposed to have it exclusively Christian, not receiving as members, or admitting to its pulpit, Christians, Deists, Pantheists, and Atheists alike, let him only say so, and we are sure that Mr. Porter, no less than ourselves, will rejoice in the change and give him credit for it.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

LATE MEETING OF THE NON-SUBSCRIBING ASSOCIATION.

We give elsewhere a condensed report of the proceedings at the late meeting of the Association of Non-Subscribing Presbyterians. It will be observed that its principal object was to elect a successor or successors to the Rev. Dr. Montgomery in his professorial office. The words "or successors" had reference to a change that had been recommended by Dr. Montgomery before his decease, and had been approved of by others, viz., to divide the duties of the Professorship

(embracing Church History, Moral Philosophy, and Pastoral Theology) between two Professors. The reasons for the proposed change, and the advantages of it, had been set forth in a circular addressed to the members, and signed by the Revs. W. Bruce and W. Crozier. To this a counter-address was published, than which nothing could be better adapted to suggest the withdrawal of the grant for the endowment of the chair, to say nothing of the discourtesy—and worse—of attributing false motives to the writers of the other circular. There was little attempt at discussing the advantages proposed by the change, and much of the debate was occupied with private and personal matters, with which the Assembly had no concern. For obvious reasons, we refrain from criticising the proceedings, so far as the candidates are concerned, and we shall merely remark, that the result was a decided triumph of the extreme party in the Association; for although, from personal considerations, several of the moderate party voted for Mr. Orr, the majority by which he was elected was so great that, even had he not had these additional votes, the result would have been the same; and the management of the affairs of the Association may now be regarded as being in the hands of the "absolute liberty" section. To what changes this state of matters in the Non-Subscribing Churches may lead, we do not even presume to suggest.

Apart from the principal object of the meeting, two or three circumstances are deserving of notice. It was very natural that, at the first meeting of the body which had been held since the death of Dr. Montgomery—and held, too, in consequence of his death—some resolution should be passed, recognising the important services of one who had been for so many years the *decus et tutamen* of the body—its chief ornament, and the able defender of its principles; yet, we grieve to say, that when such a proposition was introduced, more than one expressed impatience and dissatisfaction, and seemed to think that such a work was only a waste of time. Strangers, as they read the report of such unseemly and heartless conduct, were shocked. How humiliated must the best friends of the Association feel, to think that it contains one minister or elder so utterly incapable of admiring talent or appreciating worth, or so entirely carried away by party objects, as to forget every better feeling of his nature. In marked and gratifying contrast with such conduct were the proceedings of the Directors of the Widows' Fund Association, reported in our present number, the majority of whom had no sympathy with Dr. Montgomery's views; but who, with a heartiness and unanimity that were most striking, adopted a resolution of grateful acknowledgment of his services, and sincere regret for his removal.

One of the ministers at the late meeting of the Association protested against the practice of candidates or their friends canvassing elders without the knowledge of their minister and behind their backs. We confess we can see no objection to such proceedings. If the elders are not to be the mere tools and hacks of the minister, we think that there is no more reason to require the minister's consent to canvass them, than there is to have the elders' permission to canvass the minister. If a situation is worth having, it is worth asking for. Those who have votes to give may very properly be solicited, in the belief that in voting they will exercise

their own judgment, and not vote merely as the minister may dictate; but neither minister nor elder should rashly commit himself to any one, till he hears who are the candidates. His vote is a sacred trust, which he should give, not to please a friend, but to benefit the Church.

It was an unhappy remark of one of the ministers that he withdrew his name on a former occasion, because "he did not wish to be concerned in foolish and wicked proceedings." The President justly rebuked him for such a statement, but he might very properly have asked him to explain what the proceedings were which he thus characterised. If our memory serves us, though on the occasion referred to he was absent in name, he was present in person, and seemed to take as much interest in the business as most of those whose names were on the roll. To our mind, such conduct bespeaks more of caprice or whim than of refined sensitiveness, and tends rather to bring discredit on the individual who indulges it than on the body whose proceedings he stigmatises as "foolish and wicked."

INTELLIGENCE.

ASSOCIATION OF IRISH NON-SUBSCRIBING PRESBYTERIANS.

On Wednesday, January 17, a *pro re nata* meeting of this Association was held in the Second Meeting-house, Rosemary Street, Belfast, for the purpose of electing a successor, or successors, to the late Rev. Dr. Montgomery, in the professorial chair rendered vacant by his death, and also of considering the desirableness of holding a meeting for the transaction of general business. The Rev. J. Scott Porter, as President, occupied the chair, and the meeting having been duly opened, the roll was called over. Objection was made to the Rev R. Campbell, of Templepatrick, inasmuch as his name was not on the roll, having been withdrawn at his own particular request immediately before the last meeting of the Association, held in Banbridge, in July, 1863. Mr. Campbell stated that he had withdrawn from the Association at the time referred to, because he did not wish to be mixed up with foolish and wicked proceedings, and that he had since written to beg that his name might be restored. He was well aware that if Mr. Porter could have prevented him, he would not be here to vote to-day. The President denied that Mr. Campbell had any ground for making such a statement; he decided that every member of each of the constituent bodies in the Association is entitled to membership here, and that therefore Mr. Campbell's name should be on the roll. The President read the requisition calling the meeting, and stated the object for which it had been convened. The Rev. C. J. M'Alester rose, and, referring to the circumstance which had rendered it necessary to hold a *pro re nata* meeting, dwelt on the loss which they had sustained in the death of Dr. Montgomery. He felt that, whether they considered his long connexion with their

Body, the important services he had rendered to them, or the position to which, through his great abilities and commanding eloquence, he had raised the principle of Non-Subscription in this country, they owed it to his memory as well as to their own sense of duty, to pass a resolution conveying their feelings on his removal. He therefore begged to move—"That at this, the first meeting of the Non-Subscribing Association since the death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, we feel it incumbent upon us to record the deep sense of the loss sustained by our Church in the removal of one who, for so many years, was the able, eloquent, and successful advocate of the principle of Non-Subscription, and the valued and efficient instructor of our students in Church History and Pastoral Theology; and to convey to the family of our venerable and departed friend our sympathy with them in their heavy bereavement."

While some consultation was held between Mr. M'Alester and Mr. Nelson (Downpatrick), respecting the precise wording of the resolution, a minister spoke out and said, "We are met here for a special purpose," and Mr. Joseph Perry (Elder from Downpatrick) said, "Let us proceed with the business of the Association." Several gentlemen here rose to order, and the President decided that if a meeting thought proper to express any opinion at all on the merits of a deceased member, the resolution expressing such opinion was the first thing to be brought forward. Mr. M'Alester then moved the resolution which be had submitted; it was seconded by Mr. Nelson, and passed unanimously.

Rev. D. Whyte moved—"That it is not desirable to make any change at present in the distribution of the professorial chairs in connexion with this Association, and that the Rev. John Orr, Comber, be now appointed to fill the chair of Church History, Pastoral Theology, and Moral Philosophy, vacant by the death of Dr. Montgomery." He could say that the want of Dr. Montgomery would be greatly felt, and that the lustre of his great abilities would place his successor, however distinguished he might be, in a position that might be described as awkward. Dr. Montgomery was a man whom they all respected, as they all knew his worth. They would not soon look upon his like again. His praise was in all the Churches, and it was needless for him to repeat that praise. He believed that Mr. Orr was eminently fitted for the chair. He knew Mr. M'Alester, and, knowing him, admired him; but, at the same time, he thought it was desirable that only one professor should be appointed. Under all the circumstances, he considered that the Rev. John Orr should be elected.

Mr. John Miller (Comber) seconded the motion.

Rev. William Bruce moved an amendment—"That, after carefully considering the duties of the office held by the late Rev. Dr. Montgomery, the advancement of the students, and the best interests of the Non-Subscribing Church, we consider it highly expedient that the professorship lately held by Dr. Montgomery be divided into two parts, and that Mr. M'Alester and Mr. Orr be appointed to fill the chairs thus created." There could be no doubt as to the competency of both the gentlemen who were candidates for the vacant chair. The chair, however, seemed to be

too much for one individual, especially when it was to be undertaken along with the pastoral office. He had often thought of the subject, and he felt perfectly certain that the Chair of Ecclesiastical History alone, if fully attended to, would occupy to the utmost the attention of a man gifted even as highly as Dr. Montgomery was. The extent of this subject, and the manifold importance of it, should convince them that one minister could not overtake all the duties. Pastoral Theology, which related principally to the composition of sermons, was a matter of great ease to Dr. Montgomery, but might prove rather laborious to his successor. They were aware that, towards the close of his life, Dr. Montgomery was of opinion that a second professor should be appointed to the chair occupied by him.

Rev. Wm. Crozier (Rademon) seconded the amendment, which he regarded as of the greatest importance to their body. He could not shut his eyes to the unhappy divisions which had distracted them. If they were to be at one—if they were not to perpetuate strife and ill-will—they would see the wisdom of the measure proposed as an amendment to the original resolution. The well-disposed laity of their Church, who were sighing for peace, would regard the adoption of the amendment as an indication of coming peace, which was so much required in their Church. He spoke in the warmest terms of both candidates, and pressed upon the rev. body the desirability of appointing both.

Rev. Mr. Whitelegge (Cork) said that the impression created in his mind, before coming to the meeting, was that Mr. Orr, with whom he had had no communication, would accede to the proposed arrangement, which, he considered, would tend to harmony in their distracted Church. Before voting, he wished to know whether Mr. Orr would be willing to accept a department, if the amendment were carried. He had received a letter from Dr. Montgomery recommending the compromise.

Mr. M'Allister here rose, and said that the remarks of Mr. Whitelegge demanded some notice from him. He had hoped that in these proceedings he should have been only a listener, but a report had gained circulation calculated to injure him, and he owed it to himself to place the matter in its true light. The idea of a division of the duties in the vacant office had originated with him. When he was asked by Dr. Montgomery to become a candidate, and had afterwards received a numerously and most respectably signed requisition to the same effect, he mentioned several grounds on which he thought such a division most desirable; and Dr. Montgomery and others, after consideration of the matter, entered heartily into his views. He carried to the South letters from Dr. Montgomery—not indeed written by him, for he was too ill to write—but written by his daughter, and dictated and signed by him, recommending strongly the proposed division; but neither those letters, nor anything that he had said, afforded any ground for the idea that Mr. Orr and his supporters approved of it. On the contrary, he had stated to Mr. Whitelegge, and to all on whom he had called, that so far as he knew, Mr. Orr had not yet been informed of the scheme recommended. He had, indeed, represented Mr. Orr and himself as good friends. So they

were, and he hoped would continue to be, whatever might be the issue of this day's proceedings. He believed that in all his canvass he had done no act, and uttered no word, to which his warmest opponent could reasonably object.

After some remarks from the Rev. James Orr (Clonmel),

The Rev. John Orr said, in consequence of the question asked by Mr. Whitelegge, he thought he should say a few words. He did not think it necessary to bring forward a single argument to induce the majority of the Body to preserve the professorship in its entirety, both with regard to emoluments and responsibility. The Association should understand his intention, if the amendment be carried. He would say, in no presumptuous spirit, and in no exorbitant idea of his own qualifications, that if they agreed to the amendment, he would retire from the position he occupied as a candidate. He came to that decision on a recent occasion, with the unanimous concurrence of a large and influential body of his supporters in the North and in the South of Ireland. Any one voting for the amendment would vote against him, and substantially vote in favour of Mr. M'Alester as the sole professor.

The Rev. J. M'Caw would vote for Mr. Orr's election on the ground of fitness. He believed there was not another man in their Church so qualified to discharge the duties of the vacant office.

Mr. Campbell followed on the same side. He condemned the efforts that had been made to take advantage of the ignorance and fanaticism of country congregations.

The Rev. Classon Porter spoke in favour of the amendment. He protested against the way congregations had been canvassed on both sides with regard to this appointment, without the knowledge of the ministers, and behind their backs.

The Rev. John Montgomery supported the amendment, as it was of a pacific nature.

Rev. J. A. Crozier said that it was the earnest, indeed almost the last, urgent wish of one who was now taken from them, that a joint-professorship should be created. The object of the aged minister was peace. Almost his last wish was, that this election might not be made the means of causing further distractions in the Church; but that it might lead to a peaceable arrangement without reference to one party or another. If the contest lay between Mr. M'Alester and Mr. Orr, he would give the preference to the former; but it should be distinctly understood that Mr. M'Alester's friends consented to the amendment with a view to peace. Mr. M'Alester was peculiarly fitted for the professorship of Pastoral Theology, and Mr. Orr for the other chair proposed to be erected.

Mr. Nelson made some remarks in reply to Mr. Crozier.

The amendment was put and lost, 31 voting for it and 49 against. The original motion appointing Mr. Orr successor to Dr. Montgomery was then carried.

Mr. Orr and Mr. M'Alester briefly returned thanks to their supporters, and in doing so repudiated anything like ill-feeling.

A proposition was then submitted to the effect that a meeting of the Association, for the transaction of general business, should be

called. Considerable discussion took place regarding this matter. Ultimately it was agreed that a general meeting should be held on the third Wednesday of June.

Directors of the Widows' Fund and the late Rev. Dr. Montgomery.—At a meeting of the Directors of the Presbyterian Widows' Fund, held on January 19th, the Rev. H. Henderson, President, in the chair, it was moved by Rev. Dr. Cooke, seconded by Rev. J. Meneely, and unanimously resolved—"That the Directors feel it their melancholy duty to record their deep sense of the lively interest which the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, during the long period of his membership, always manifested in the prosperity of the Fund; more especially for the valuable services he rendered in obtaining the Act of Incorporation, and in the subsequent management of the Smithboro' Estate; and that the President be instructed to communicate this resolution to Mrs. Montgomery, with the expression of the sympathy of the Directors in her afflictive family bereavement."

OBITUARY.

Died, on Dec. 28, at Hillhouse, Newry, Miss Ann Bowles.

Died, on Jan. 18, at his residence, near Ballyclare, Mr. James Laird, an Elder of the Congregation of Ballyclare in connexion with the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, and a most intelligent and worthy man.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Rev. S. C. Nelson, on his own part, and that of the Rev. D. Whyte, objects to the passage in our obituary of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, in our last number, in which we stated that "those who lately differed from Dr. Montgomery, interpreted the constitution of the Remonstrant Synod as being more comprehensive in its principles than its founders ever designed it to be." We made the statement objected to on the authority of Dr. Montgomery himself, who, we believe, drew up the constitution of the Synod; and on the knowledge we possessed of the character of the most prominent among his fellow-labourers, who, we are sure, never contemplated the admission into Remonstrant pulpits, of ministers who saw nothing specially divine in Christ and Christianity.

Our Summary of Intelligence is held over for want of space.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] MARCH, 1866. [No. 2.

WHAT IS UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY?

WHILE sceptical opinions have of late years sheltered themselves under the Unitarian name, and while many, perplexed and shocked by the anti-Christian views which have been spoken, preached, and printed in connexion with it, are disposed to renounce it altogether, and thus escape from the odium which attaches to it, it may be well to consider what is really meant by Unitarian Christianity? We shall find that there is nothing in it to countenance scepticism and unbelief in any form—nothing in it to render devout and intelligent believers in a Divine Revelation ashamed of its profession. We attach no value to the ideas of Unitarianism which have recently been propounded in England. The tendency to reject every thing of supernatural revelation, which has manifested itself very plainly in other Protestant Churches, has naturally enough been more largely exhibited in the Unitarian Church, as it fosters a spirit of free inquiry, and allows the largest latitude of belief. Were we to be guided by the opinion of those who have latterly undertaken to answer the question—What is Unitarian Christianity? we should form the most confused ideas of its principles and tenets. One would lead us to believe that it embraces all who are willing to accept Jesus as their teacher, whatever opinion they may hold of his authority—whether they regard him as being sent of God, or coming of himself—whether they consider him as possessing only human wisdom, attained through the ordinary channels of information, or being enlightened by the Spirit of God. Another argues that all should be classed as Unitarian Christians, who worship One God in one Person, whether they be Christian in the proper sense, Jew, or Heathen. Another explains it to be identical with Deism in its essential principles, and would consider

the men who were the learned defenders of Deism as against Christianity in the past century, were they living now, as members and ornaments of the Unitarian Church. Others, again, suggest that Unitarianism in its best sense simply means "uniting," and would argue that if men of various opinions—Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents, Trinitarians and Anti-Trinitarians, Swedenborgians and Secularists were to unite in one organization for religious purposes, such an *omnium gatherum* would be the true Unitarian Church! It is no wonder that, amid such conflicting views, simple minds are perplexed; and no wonder that men of serious mind and Christian principle, feel humiliated to bear so questionable a name. We occasionally see notices in the denominational organs, of such and such ministers having given lectures in explanation of Unitarianism. Were some dozen of such lectures to be published, we venture to affirm that they would present, not one system of belief, but several; and prove to any who may yet be doubtful, that now-a-days "Unitarian Christianity," chameleon-like, changes its complexion according to locality, and is one thing or another,—from a modified orthodoxy to rank unbelief,—according to the temperament or the conceit, the Christianity or the Deism of the preacher. Nay, more; if extracts were taken from certain denominational journals, presenting the views of the editors at different dates, respecting Unitarianism, there would be found such a variety as it would be difficult to reconcile with any fixed system of religious belief.

And is Unitarian Christianity such a fluctuating and undefinable system,—a cloud that is ever changing its colour and its form, and threatening to vanish into the atmosphere of unbelief? We think not. If it were, it would have no value for ourselves, and no value for the world; and any effort to spread it would be time and labour wasted. But it is far otherwise: and it is well that we should keep before our mind the holy principles it embodies, and not suffer ourselves to be carried away by hackneyed tirades against "creeds," and vapid declamations about "free inquiry."

To know what is meant by "Unitarian Christianity," as the phrase has now been employed for half a century at least, we may consider the terms of which it consists.

We think they will be found distinct and explicit enough. It is Christianity, and not Judaism; Christianity, and not Deism. It is the religion taught by Christ and his Apostles. Of this religion, all we know is embodied in the Holy Scriptures,—notwithstanding the protest which was made by a Unitarian minister some time ago against calling the Scriptures "holy," we must so speak of them, for so all Christians regard them. This Christianity includes what have been not unhappily termed "the Christian pieties and charities;" they are taught and exemplified by Christ, and they are part and parcel of his religion. It also teaches the evil of sin, the efficacy of repentance, the value of holiness, the resurrection from the dead, and a life of retribution beyond. These doctrines Christianity sets before us, not as human speculations or the results of human reasoning and reflection, but as revelations made to us by him whom God sent. If it be evident that Christ taught these doctrines, it is just as evident that he taught them "as one having authority," as one "whom God sent," and who "spoke the words of God." We cannot separate the religion of Christ from his mission; upon a belief in that mission he rests his doctrines and precepts, as on a foundation. Others may have taught something of his doctrine before he came. We know, indeed, that under the Jewish law a part of his religion was inculcated; and we know, too, that wise men among the Gentiles had attained to something of the spiritual truth which the Saviour afterwards expressed; but he unfolded yet farther the will of God, and taught it as by God's authority. This recognition of Jesus as the Christ—the divinely-appointed revealer of the Father's will—is inseparable from Christianity. It has been suggested that if a man seek to cultivate the pieties and charities that are presented in the words and life of Christ, he is truly a Christian, though he should entirely reject the idea of Christ's supernatural mission. Such a man may be far better in heart and life than many a one who accepts Christ as "sent from God;" but he cannot be said to believe in Christianity, for it includes, as one of its doctrines, and indeed as its distinguishing doctrine, the divine mission of its founder. In successive ages, and in various Churches, other dogmas have been taught as a part of Christianity, which legitimate criticism has

rejected; but the views which we have mentioned as included in the religion taught by Jesus, no fair interpretation of his words can set aside. If we do reject them, it is because we reject his own plain statements; and he who rejects the plain statements of the Christ can hardly claim the Christian name.

Here, then, we see what is implied in "Christianity." But the term "Unitarian" restricts its meaning, limiting it to those who, accepting the revelation which God has given us in his Son, so interpret, and, they believe, rightly interpret, the Christian records, as to reject the prevailing belief in a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. Hence the name by which the denomination is distinguished from the mass of Christian believers around them. Many volumes have been written by gifted and good men, not only in defence of Revealed Religion, but also of the truth of the Unitarian doctrine in connexion with it; and such an interpretation of the sacred Scriptures has been well known as "Unitarian Christianity."

We admit that terms are sometimes used in a sense different from that which their etymology would indicate; and if it could be shown that "Unitarian Christianity" has been commonly employed to denote one or other of those wild and vague forms of religious thought to which we have referred, the use of the phrase in such a sense might be justified; but happily it can be shown that, till within the last few years, dating, we believe, from the time of Theodore Parker's death, it was never applied to any but to those who, accepting Divine Revelation, and admitting the authority of Scripture fairly interpreted, held that the Father only is the proper object of worship, and that Jesus Christ is his well-beloved Son and divinely-appointed messenger. That there have been various schools of Unitarianism we freely admit, as those of Priestley, Price, and Channing; but whatever diversities of opinion they held, they agreed in acknowledging the supernatural mission of Christ, and the revelation embodied in the Holy Scriptures. In confirmation of this fact, we might give extracts from a host of distinguished authors, who have been the acknowledged exponents and defenders of Unitarianism; and, while we might find in their works conflicting views of the nature of Christ, and of other matters, their testimony is uniform and distinct

respecting the authority of revealed religion. The following brief extracts are from a sermon of Dr. Channing, written in explanation of "Unitarian Christianity," and they exhibit the prevailing opinions which distinguished Unitarians not only in America, but also in England, till within the last few years:—

"We regard the Scriptures as the records of God's successive revelations to mankind, and particularly of the last and most perfect revelation of his will by Jesus Christ. . . . Jesus Christ is the only Master of Christians, and whatever he taught, either during his personal ministry, or by his inspired Apostles, we regard as of divine authority, and profess to make the rule of our lives."—*Works*, Belfast Edition, Vol. i. p. 531.

"I now proceed to give our views of the mediation of Christ, and of the purposes of his mission. With regard to the great object which Jesus came to accomplish, there seems to be no possibility of mistake. We believe that he was sent by the Father, to effect a moral or spiritual deliverance of mankind—that is, to rescue men from sin and its consequences, and to bring them to a state of everlasting purity and happiness. We believe, too, that he accomplishes this sublime purpose by a variety of methods; by his instructions respecting God's unity, parental character, and moral government, which are admirably fitted to reclaim the world from idolatry and impiety, to the knowledge, love, and obedience of the Creator; by his promises of pardon to the penitent, and of Divine assistance to those who labour for progress in moral excellence; by the light which he has thrown on the path of duty; by his own spotless example, in which the loveliness and sublimity of virtue shine forth to warm and quicken, as well as guide us to perfection; by his threatenings against incorrigible guilt; by his glorious discoveries of immortality; by his sufferings and death; by that signal event, the resurrection, which powerfully bore witness to his Divine mission, and brought down to men's senses a future life; by his continual intercession, which obtains for us spiritual aid and blessings; and by the power with which he is invested of raising the dead, judging the world, and conferring the everlasting rewards promised to the faithful."—P. 544.

Comparing the various expositions of Unitarian Christianity which the literature of our denomination contains, they will be found to agree in acknowledging the divine authority of Christ and his religion, while in matters of detail they may differ, as may be expected where happily there is no human creed to bind the members of the church; and hence we argue, not only from the legitimate meaning of the terms, but also from the sense in which they have been commonly employed, that "Unitarian Christianity" is not a vague and changing system, but that, whether in the fundamental rules of

the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, or elsewhere, they have a distinct and important meaning, which it should be the object of all who prize a rational and scriptural faith to vindicate and maintain, regardless alike of the accusations of heresy and unbelief which assail them on the one hand, or of the charges of bigotry and intolerance which beset them on the other.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 12.)

II.—James Fleming (1658—1662) was the second minister of Glenarm. Between the death or removal of Mr. Fenton, in 1655, and the appointment of his successor, in 1658, there was an interval of three years, respecting which period, the absence of contemporaneous records prevents me from being able to furnish any information. The same circumstance also puts it out of my power to say much more concerning the ministry of Mr. Fleming himself, than to state the terms of its commencement and the abrupt manner of its close. The minute-book of the Antrim meeting (referred to in my last paper) informs us that in the month of May, 1658, Mr. James Fleming was on trials for Glenarm, on bonds for sixty pounds a year, with a manse and glebe. This was a tolerably pleasant location, and on these liberal terms Mr. Fleming was, during the course of 1658, ordained as minister of Glenarm. But he was not long to continue there undisturbed. For three years he was allowed to enjoy his sixty pounds a year, with his manse and glebe; but in 1661 came the Act of Uniformity, and, under the operation of that Act, he was in that year ejected from his manse and glebe, and I fear that, at the same time, he lost his sixty pounds a year. I am sorry to add, that, shortly afterwards, Mr. Fleming also lost what was of greater value than either manse, or glebe, or tithes—I mean his own consistency and uprightness of character. In the storm of persecution which then raged around the Presbyterian ministers of Ulster, he was not able to keep fast hold of his integrity. Unfortunately, he let it go;

but he held by it as long as he could. His position in Glenarm, amongst a poor and extensively Roman Catholic population, was doubtless singularly trying; and if at last he succumbed to the exigencies of his lot, we are bound in charity to remember the strength of the temptation before which he fell. His case was, in many respects, peculiar. Unlike the other six Irish Presbyterian ministers who, in 1661, conformed to Prelacy, and who were nearly all located in the north of County Antrim, Mr. Fleming did not desert his Church on the first appearance of danger. On the contrary, Mr. Adair expressly states that he "stood out longer than the rest." For this reason his name appears on Wodrow's list of the Irish ejected ministers, as given by Dr. Reid (ii. 352). It also appears on another list which I have of the Presbyterian ministers who attended a Synod at Ballymena in 1662. But about this latter date, Mr. Fleming's firmness seems to have given way, for he certainly did, shortly afterwards, conform to the Established Church. And not the least singular part of the transaction is, that, unlike those of his brethren who were guilty of a similar defection, he does not appear to have derived any professional benefit from his unfaithfulness. I have never met with any record of his having received any prelatical appointment as the reward of his conformity. He certainly was not allowed to resume his benefice at Glenarm. On his ejection therefrom, in April, 1661, that benefice, with its sixty pounds a year and manse and glebe, was immediately bestowed upon another apostate, a recreant Presbyterian probationer, called Andrew Nesbitt. Mr. Nesbitt seems to have held the living of Glenarm for several years; but, according to Mr. Adair's description of that gentleman's latter end—which, on account of its local character, I here transcribe—he paid very dearly for his prelatical appointment before all was over:—

"Mr. Nesbitt, of Glenarm," says Mr. Adair in his Manuscript history, "being sick, and expecting death, as it fell out, sent for Mr. Adair, his nearest neighbouring minister [in Cairncastle], whom he had often before chided and reflected on for gathering the people of the parish by parcels where Nesbitt was their curate, and had threatened severity to him for so doing, beside oppressing the people on account of non-conformity. Yet finding himself going out of the world, he with great expressions and much seeming seriousness, renounced the course he had been upon. He said he had sold his Master for a piece of bread, and had joined with a

set of men that God was not among, a generation whom God would plague, and he doubted if there was mercy for him, with many words to that purpose. Mr. Adair told him that he was glad he was brought that length. He put him in mind of his former courses, during these latter years, which had been very gross for oppression, pride, drunkenness, regardlessness of the Sabbath, lying, &c. &c. Yet he added that if he were sincere in what he expressed as to his repentance and flying to Christ, there might be hope. But he was afraid that if he recovered that sickness, he would return again, and forget his recantation. Mr. Nesbitt replied that through God's strength it should never be so. It is observable that those who turned to conformity from their brethren and the way of God, turned to be another kind of creatures than they had been generally. While they continued, they were sober, and some of them well-gifted. When they conformed, they became loose, oppressive, proud, and divers of them profane."

It is to be hoped that this latter description did not apply to Mr. Fleming, of Glenarm. That minister doubtless fell from his steadfastness, and his backsliding, like that of Mr. Nesbitt, must have reproved him sore; but we can hardly think that he was led by it into the errors of the wicked.

Concerning the history of the congregation, as distinguished from the minister, of Glenarm at this trying period, the only tradition I have met with (for record there is none), is that at this time one of the Donnelson family, who lived at the Bay, near Cairnlough, was at the trouble and expense of enlarging his barn considerably so as to accommodate his Presbyterian co-religionists with a place for public worship, after they and their pastor had been ejected from the Parish Church. In this barn Mr. Fleming probably ministered to the faithful Presbyterians of the town and neighbourhood of Glenarm during the bitter months which witnessed his internal struggle against conformity; and here, also, after the shepherd had been himself unfaithful, it is likely that the flock continued occasionally to assemble, hearing the Word from any outcast minister of their persecuted church who might happen to be in their neighbourhood, and "waiting for the consolation of Israel," which, returning in a few years to their afflicted Zion, allowed them once more to gather themselves together within the precincts of a sacred fold. And when, on this latter occasion, they did again meet together, they had the satisfaction of reflecting that the "meeting-house" was their own.

III.—David Houston (1662–1671) has been set down by me as the third minister of Glenarm, during the years indicated. But it is somewhat doubtful whether I am justified in speaking of Mr. Houston as being, in any sense of the word, a "regular" minister of Glenarm. Dr. Reid calls him "an indiscreet and turbulent licentiate;" and, certainly, during his residence in Ulster he gave no little trouble to the brethren of the different Presbyterian meetings. Still, it is undeniable that for several years after Mr. Fleming's conformity to the Established Church, and, perhaps, until 1671, when Mr. John Anderson was appointed to the charge of the congregation whose history I am now writing, Mr. Houston did supply with preaching the Presbyterians of Glenarm. And therefore I have not thought it right to omit his name entirely from my list. Of this gentleman's antecedents before he came to Glenarm I know nothing, except that he was a licentiate, or probationer of the Presbytery of Route, and therefore, probably, a native of that part of County Antrim. Neither can I say much, on the authority of original documents, as to his conduct or ministry in Glenarm, for unfortunately the records of the history of Presbyterianism in this neighbourhood at that period are lost. The first mention that I find of his name in the minutes of the Antrim meeting is under date August 8, 1671. At that time he had recently left Glenarm; but, as the entry which I am now about to quote refers to the period of Mr. Houston's ministry in that town, I think it may with propriety be introduced in this place. In this minute the reader will observe a reference to certain "scandals vented" against this minister in Glenarm. The Synod of 1691 also speaks of "the irregular and immoral practices whereon he had been formerly deposed;" and Dr. Reid alludes to "several alleged immoralities in his conduct while supplying Glenarm." But perhaps impartial criticism, viewing all the facts of the case, and considering all the circumstances of the times, will conclude that the irregularities referred to were rather ecclesiastical than personal. Very few of the ministers of that day of the strict school to which Mr. Houston belonged were "immoral," in the conventional sense of that word. They rather inclined to the opposite extreme of asceticism and self-denial.

"1671, *August* 8.—At Ballyclare. Mr. David Houston appearing this day before the meeting, and the brethren taking his case into their consideration, to wit his disorderliness in exercising a ministry without consent of the meeting, and also divers other more flagrant stumblings in his way and carriage, give their advice to him that he should withdraw a while out of the country and remove to Scotland, which he offered to do, providing he got a testimonial from this meeting. The brethren are not able to give him a testimonial in regard to some scandals vented on him while he was at Glenarm, which they find not themselves at present in a capacity to try; but they are disposed to write a line with him, giving as favourable a representation of his case as they can—*salvâ veritate*—with which the said Mr. David was satisfied, and Mr. Adair was appointed to write the letter."

At the next meeting, Mr. Houston seems to have changed his mind as to the necessity of his leaving Ireland to gratify his brethren, for he then "desired the meeting's advice to him for going to Scotland to be taken off." But a cloud of some kind continued to hang over his ministry in Glenarm; for on August 13, 1672, "the brethren that were to be at Glenarm at the Communion were appointed to consider of the libel anent Mr. David Houston there, and transmit their finding to the several meetings." Accordingly, in the following month, these brethren reported to the Antrim meeting "that they had met at Glenarm, and that Mr. David Houston being also present, they had taken pains to confer with him upon these articles of libel, and that thereafter Mr. David had given in a confession in writing, relating to the said articles in so far as he considered himself guilty." But as this confession does not relate to anything in his personal or ministerial conduct during his stay in Glenarm, and as the principal object of the brethren in proceeding against him is revealed in their expressed wish "that he should be restricted from preaching in those places where there had been division about him," I think we are warranted in looking upon Mr. Houston, in this matter, as an offender rather against Presbyterian discipline than against the moral law. At any rate, I am not called upon to follow his case any further in connexion with the history of the Congregation of Glenarm. But, for the satisfaction of the general reader, I may be allowed here to mention a few facts connected with the subsequent eventful career of this third minister of Glenarm. After leaving Glenarm, Mr. Houston supplied for a time the

Presbyterian Congregation of Ballymoney. Here he became acquainted with Alexander Peden, whose "Prophecies" are still a household book in the homesteads of our Presbyterian peasantry; and adopting some of the enthusiastic notions and irregular practices of his friend and companion, he soon incurred the serious animadversions of his brethren of the Route meeting. Being taken to task by them for his impatience of Presbyterial control, he appeared before them at Macosquin, on August 23, 1671, and, confessing his errors, promised more dutiful behaviour for the time to come. Apparently, however, he soon relapsed into his former ways; for in January, 1672, his brethren of Route were obliged again to remonstrate with him, on which occasion they also advised him, as the Antrim meeting had previously done, to withdraw for a time to Scotland. But in neither case would he take the hint, and therefore in the following month—February, 1672—the brethren of Route formally withdrew from him his license to preach. Under this ecclesiastical ban he continued to lie, until the middle of the year 1673, when, expressing contrition for his past insubordination, and promising future amendment, he was restored to the office of a licentiate, and received a testimonial, with which he withdrew to Scotland. Here he continued for several years; but returning to Ulster in 1686, it was found that his Scotch visit had not produced upon him its intended good effect. He speedily fell into irregularities similar to those of which he had been previously guilty; and being cited to appear before the Presbytery of Route at Macosquin, on February 8, 1687, and failing to do so, or to answer the charges alleged against him, he was on that day finally deposed from the office of the ministry in the Presbyterian Church.

A few months before the passing of this sentence, he had again withdrawn to Scotland, where he enrolled himself amongst the followers of the brave and devoted Renwick and Peden.* But here he had as little peace as

* This was on December 22, 1686; but the Scottish brethren did not, on this occasion, receive Mr. Houston into their society until they had most minutely investigated the charges which had been alleged against him. They had even taken the precaution of previously sending over a special commissioner to Ireland to inquire personally into the matter on the spot; and it was only after hearing this commissioner's report, which declared the scandals to be calumnies, and requiring and

in Ireland: for the seizure of Renwick, and consequent dispersion of his associates, obliged him, in 1688, once more to take refuge in Ulster, where he found shelter with some faithful adherents, who, on account of their attachment to him, began to be called "Houstonites." But the shelter did not long imply safety. He was pursued into Ulster by officers of "justice," from Scotland, who in May, 1688, arrested him in his Irish fastness, and transmitted him, in charge of an armed guard, for trial to Edinburgh. On his way thither, not the least singular occurrence in his eventful life was appointed to befal him. As he was being conveyed through Ayrshire, he was rescued from his military escort by some of his brave adherents in that country, who, boldly attacking the soldiers by whom he was accompanied, and killing several of them, delivered their beloved minister out of the hands of his enemies. In the beginning of 1689, he appears to have come back to Ireland; for he was in the city of Derry during the time that it was besieged by King James's army, and Governor Walker, in his account of that event, refers to him in the following not very flattering terms:—"Mr. Houston was very troublesome, and would admit none to fight for the Protestant religion till they had first taken the Covenant."* After the siege, Mr. Houston continued to be as "troublesome" as ever to his brethren in the Irish Presbyterian Church. In the Presbyterial records of those days frequent mention is made of his irregularities, until at length his case was taken up by the highest court in the Presbyterian Church; and the Synod, which met at Antrim in September, 1691, ordered a declaration to be published, detailing "the irregular and immoral practices whereon he had been formally deposed," and stating that, "as he is henceforth to be looked upon as not of our communion, it is expected and required that none of our people do join with him in Gospel ordinances, under pain of ecclesiastical censures."

After this heavy blow and severe discouragement to

receiving from Mr. Houston himself the fullest explanation of the entire matter, that they resolved he had given "very demonstrative evidences of his innocence," and admitted him into their religious connexion.—*See Renwick's Letters, January* 11, 1687.

* Some persons say that Houston was not at the siege of Derry at all. His name certainly does not occur on M'Kenzie's list of the Presbyterian ministers who were present on that occasion.

the exercise of his ministry in Ireland, Mr. Houston once more withdrew to Scotland, where he seems to have returned to his old ways; for in March, 1692, we find the Presbytery of Ayr in correspondence with the ministers in Antrim respecting his irregular proceedings. At this point Dr. Reid loses sight of Mr. Houston, and says that "his subsequent history has sunk into oblivion." But this latter assertion is not quite correct. Through the kind assistance of Rev. J. A. Chancellor, of Belfast, I am happy to be able to add the following particulars concerning the last few years of this remarkable man's eventful life. Returning, for the last time, from Scotland, shortly after 1692, he settled in the north of County Antrim, near Armoy, where a meeting-house was built for him, the ruins of which have but lately been removed. Here he was described, in 1694, by an Episcopalian correspondent of the Lords Justices as "a clergyman that preaches up the Solemn League and Covenant, accusing the people of Scotland of perjury in not sticking to their League, and having a congregation of 500 resolute fellows that adhere to him." People from Scotland, and other parts of Ulster, often visited him, seeking marriage or baptism at his hands; and from thence he went forth on frequent excursions, as his strength permitted him, through the Counties of Antrim, Down, and Londonderry, dispensing ordinances with great boldness and unshrinking fidelity, till his death, in 1696. His mortal remains were interred at Connor, in County Antrim, and the following is a copy of the inscription upon his tombstone:—"Here lyes the body of Mr. David Houston, a faithful minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, who departed this present life the 8th of Dec., in the year 1696, and of his age the 63rd year."* Respecting Mr. Houston's character and

* This description was fortunately copied so long ago as 1747, and has been kindly furnished to me by my friend Mr. Chancellor, who adds that it is now no longer to be seen; for that Houston's grave has been appropriated to another person, and a new name inscribed upon his tombstone. This piece of Vandalism, whether it arise from ignorance or bigotry, every one must condemn; but I am sorry to add that it is not by any means a solitary instance of the shamefully ungrateful manner in which the tombstones of old Presbyterian ministers are treated even by Presbyterians. A case of obliteration and substitution, just as disgraceful as the foregoing, could be pointed out not many miles from the spot where I am now writing.

conduct, different people will take different views, according to their ecclesiastical prejudices and connexions; but one thing is undeniable—that, let him have been what he may, he has left his mark on the religious history of the province. The "Houstonites" of 1689 are represented amongst us in the present day by "The Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland," whose members are commonly called "Covenanters"—a most respectable body of people, whose founder in Ulster was undoubtedly DAVID HOUSTON, the brave, though it may be the erratic, confessor who in his youth ministered for some years amongst the Presbyterians of the town and neighbourhood of Glenarm.

HYMN FROM THE GERMAN.

BY REV. N. L. FROTHINGHAM, D.D.

O Gott, Du Frommer Gott.

O GOD, thou faithful God!
  Thou well-spring of all blessing!
In whom we all exist,
  From whom we're all possessing!
Give me a body sound;
  And in it, builded well,
Let an unblemished soul
  And a good conscience dwell.

Afford me will and strength
  To do the work assigned me;
Whereto, in my true place,
  Thy law may call and find me,
Let it be timely done,
  With eager readiness,
And what is done in thee
  Have ever good success.

Help me to speak but that
  Which I can stand maintaining,
And banish from my lips
  The word that's coarse and staining;

And when the duty comes
To speak with earnest stress,
Then grant the needed force
Unmixed with bitterness.

When trouble shall break in,
Let me not turn despairer;
But give a steadfast heart,
And make me a Cross-Bearer.
When help and comfort fail,
Send to myself the Friend,
Who, closer than a brother,
Shall watch the sorrow's end.

REMARKS ON MR. MARTINEAU'S "NOTE OR TWO."

Mr. Martineau either cannot or will not distinguish between the province of the historian and that of the apologist. The question at issue between us is purely historical. He asked for information respecting a simple matter of fact; namely, whether any one had ever maintained "that Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church, or the proper term of fellowship in it:" a point which might be settled to their mutual satisfaction by persons holding diametrically opposite opinions on the subject matter of the inquiry: yet when testimony has been produced, which he ought simply to weigh and consider with a view to determine its relevancy as proof of the fact, he turns aside to give his own opinions respecting the proposition above stated; and to defend them; and to repudiate those which he ascribes to me. He occupies fully a third of his "One or Two Notes" in statements of this kind. This is not the proper way of conducting a historical investigation; and I decline to follow him into a field of inquiry so totally distinct from that into which his challenge tempted me to enter.

Mr. Martineau does not seem ever to have taken into consideration that when a writer publishes to the world a challenge calling for proof of a particular fact *in terms selected by himself*, he is bound to adhere to these terms of his own choice. If evidence is produced in strict accordance with those terms, it is his duty to acknowledge that his challenge has been fairly met. Certainly he is at liberty

to withdraw his challenge if he pleases; or to issue a new one with such amendments as he may think fit to introduce. But to introduce such *ex post facto* amendments, while *professing simply to repeat the original challenge*, is nothing less than shifting the ground of discussion without notice; which has always been reckoned one of the least respectable of the arts of controversy. In my last letter I pointed out that in his reply to my first, he had, while professing to repeat his challenge, introduced into it *without notice to the reader of any alteration*, an additional clause consisting of three lines of type, involving an entirely new and distinct issue, of which not one syllable was contained in his published challenge. Against this I protested. He now argues that he had a right to stick in these words and the qualification which they imply, inasmuch as they referred to something that fell from Mr. Ham, last summer, in the course of his six or eight weeks' controversy in the columns of *The Inquirer!* But if he meant these restrictions and qualifications to be understood as part of his challenge, *why did he not put them into it?* It would have been as easy to put them into it then as now. If he subsequently found that these restrictions and limitations, though not expressed at first, were necessary to bring out his meaning, it appears to me that the proper course for him to follow would have been to say that the testimony produced, though it might or might not be applicable to the terms of his demand, was not applicable to the question which was in his thoughts, and which he intended to raise, at the time when he wrote it; and that, in order to bring out his meaning fully, he felt it necessary to append to it such and such explanations and limitations. This, however, Mr. Martineau did not do. He professed to repeat his challenge; and in doing so, interpolated terms which formed no part of it, without calling attention to the change. It is obvious that a writer who takes the liberty of interpolating his works with ideas which, as he alleges, were in his head while writing, but of which he never allowed a hint to drop from his pen, can neither be confuted nor assented to. Before we can know whether we agree with him, or differ from him, we must have the power of turning his brain inside out, in order to see what notions, unexpressed in his words, are stowed away in its hidden recesses!

As might be expected from the manner in which Mr. Martineau has managed his share of this correspondence, there is as yet no approach to an agreement between him and me with respect to the historical question raised by his letter to *The Inquirer;* nor do I see how any agreement is possible so long as he claims the liberty of modifying the terms of the question from time to time, by the introduction of his hitherto unexpressed thoughts as part of it. It is scarcely necessary to point out that in his "One or Two Notes" he enunciates a new modification of his challenge, and this like the former one is slipped in *sub silentio*. The question he asked originally was, whether any persons could be named who maintained "that *Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty* is the PROPER BASIS of the Christian Church, or TERM OF FELLOWSHIP in it." But it now appears that he conceives his demand is not satisfied unless some one can be produced who holds "that the PARAMOUNT OBJECTS of a Church are *not worship and a religious life*, but *an intellectual end, Free Inquiry*." Is it possible that a man of Mr. Martineau's penetration cannot perceive that this is a totally distinct question from that which he originally proposed? Is he really unable to distinguish between the *basis* (or foundation) of a building, and the purpose for which it is built? Does he not know that in every society the *term of fellowship* (or condition of membership), which must be fulfilled before entering it, is one thing, and the object for which the members are to labour after their admission into it is *necessarily another*, and often a very different thing? The original question is that which I undertook to answer, for it relates to a matter of much interest which now occupies the thoughts of many studious men, and it is of great practical importance, for it threatens to tear into pieces a respectable branch of the Church of Christ. The second is an insignificant and unprofitable inquiry, which, on any other authority than his own, I should not have believed that Mr. Martineau would have thought worth his while to propose for discussion; and in the discussion of which I should certainly not have thought it worth my while to engage.

Assuming, as he does, the privilege of incorporating his own unuttered thoughts with his published declarations,

and requiring them to be accepted as if they were the statements originally made, Mr. Martineau naturally indulges himself and his friends in a similar liberty with reference to their language. He uses and allows this license in reference to gentlemen who have not Mr. Hain to fall back upon. For example, when Mr. Maginnis declares that "*Free and Fearless Inquiry* is the GROUNDWORK of his church," Mr. Martineau assures us that this does not mean that it is the "BASIS" of the Church. When Mr. Nelson tells us that his church's "ESSENTIAL BOND OF UNION is *Free Inquiry*," we learn on the same authority that this does not by any means imply that it is the "PROPER TERM OF FELLOWSHIP" in it. When Mr. John Porter proclaims, as he has done, *usque ad nauseam*, that "ABSOLUTE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY is the principle of his ecclesiastical body," Mr. Martineau will not allow it to be supposed that these words could mean that "Religious Liberty was the proper basis of the Christian Church or term of Christian fellowship." Even when his young friend, Mr. Worthington, was *believed* to have declared that "the Christian Church is *unfettered by creed, by tie, or* BY ANYTHING, and that it holds as its members the good and the true *of all ages and of every age*" [and therefore includes myriads of unbelievers—Jews, Mahometans, Heathens, Hindoos, Hottentots, Atheists, Esquimaux, &c. &c. &c.] Mr. Martineau could not see in it anything that came up to the (secret) conditions of his challenge. He was rather surprised at my being offended, as he supposed me to be, with "the catholicity" of his young friend's principle of church union, and proceeded to read me a lecture on the subject.

After these astounding examples of his manner of interpreting language, we can no longer feel surprise that he cannot find the principle of religious liberty as the basis of the church, and its term of fellowship in the declaration of Mr. W. C. Coupland, that in the church, "as he conceives it, the *indispensable acknowledgment* must be UNCONDITIONAL LIBERTY; *a liberty which shall have* NO INTELLECTUAL BOUNDS; which both in word and deed *renounces every creed;*" and in which the sole condition of membership shall be "a confession of individual and social imperfection:" that it "will be a community of joyous way-

farers," in which *even atheism "shall have free course!"* Nor in that of Mr. Andrew Davison, who tells us that in the church it ought to be an open question "*whether God speaks most divinely through Jesus, or Mahomet, or Joseph Smith!*" Nor can we be astonished now if Mr. Martineau should fail to see any proof of the existence of the "obnoxious doctrine," in the other declarations on which he has hitherto expressed no opinion;—that of Mr. Page Hopps, "that the search for truth knows no limits in nature, *and should bring no disqualifications in the church;*" —that of Mr. Robert M'Calmont, that he and his fellow-labourers were "endeavouring to build up a church which should admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahometans; a church from which not even Atheists should be excluded; and in which a minister if he became an Atheist should not be called upon to resign:" nor in that of the minister whose "broad church" would include "men of all opinions without regard to their *isms:* Catholics, Protestants, Calvinists, Arminians, Trinitarians, Unitarians, Jews, Mahometans, and Deists." It is true that this reverend gentleman on second thoughts found that Atheists could not well be included in his "broad church;" but as they certainly would not claim admission, their exclusion could scarcely be regarded as an infringement on the rule of "Absolute Religious Liberty."

I feel myself justified in going a step further. Supposing that I could produce some one who had expressed that "non-exclusive" principle of which Mr. Martineau doubted the existence, *in the very terms employed in his own challenge*,—supposing that I could lay my hand on a book or a sermon in which it was maintained, in so many words, that "*Free Inquiry or Religious Liberty is the proper basis of the Christian Church and term of Christian fellowship*" —Mr. Martineau would not be—at least need not be—at all staggered. He could meet it in the same way in which he has already met so many other statements of the same kind, and precisely to the same effect. He might say of it as he has said of them, that its author "did not set aside the *paramount objects* of a church—worship and a religious life—in favour of a purely *intellectual end*—Free Inquiry:" and he might say apologetically for him, as he has said on behalf of Messrs. Coupland and Davi-

son, that, on the contrary, "this [imaginary] writer gives to these paramount objects of a church so dominant a place, and believes them to meet such a deep consent from the hearts of all men, as to reduce the widest intellectual differences into insignificance, and fuse into one spiritual whole elements logically incongruous," &c. &c. &c. There is nothing to prevent this from being said in the supposed case, any more than there was in the cases with reference to which it was actually said: and on the ground of this argument Mr. Martineau, though his challenge had been met explicitly *in its very terms*, might deny that it had been met at all, as he has done with respect to them.

And now, having reduced Mr. Martineau's reasoning to this palpable absurdity, I leave it to make its own impression on the mind of any thinking man. For my own part, I have not the slightest doubt that the opinion which Mr. Martineau once declared that he "heartily despised," but of which in his "One or Two Notes" he appears to me to speak with much respect, is one that has been maintained, now exists, and is making progress.

J. Scott Porter.

Addendum.—In order to keep apart discussions which, though related to each other, are distinct, I place here some remarks on the communications from his reverend correspondents, which Mr. Martineau has epitomized in his "One or Two Notes."

Those from Messrs. Nelson and Porter affirm that Mr. Martineau has correctly interpreted the meaning of their declarations above referred to. This assertion is easily disposed of. *In the first place*, these reverend gentlemen come too late with their testimony. Their declarations have been before the world for years. During the interval which has elapsed since they were published, they have been criticised, commented on, censured and applauded, on the supposition that their words meant what they distinctly express; yet never, till the month of January, 1866, did either of them dispute the accuracy of that interpretation. With them, therefore, it is a mere afterthought, and scarcely deserves any farther notice. *Secondly*, the interpretation under which they are now desirous of escaping from the legitimate effect of their former declarations, is utterly irreconcilable with their own language, as has already been abundantly shown, and is, therefore, totally inadmissible. I may add, that if these reverend gentlemen did not mean to assert that their Presbytery is "bound by no creed whatever,"

—that it "requires no test of belief whatever, as a condition of religious communion"—that its "essential bond of union is Religious Liberty"—that "Absolute Religious Liberty is its principle"—they have egregiously misled several of the advanced and prominent adherents of their own cause, who have undoubtedly joined it or adhered to it on the faith of these and similar declarations, understood in their plain literal and *liberal* sense.

As to Mr. Maginnis, it is impossible to attach any weight to any assertion of his in reference to the words from his sermon on which I have commented. Those words he professes to quote from a speech by my father pronounced on taking the chair as first Moderator of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, and are so garbled that, as he gives them, they are neither more nor less than a shameless forgery, calculated to misrepresent the sentiments of the honoured dead, and to bring disgrace upon the church of which he was himself a member. I decline to accept any statement on this subject on the authority of Mr. Maginnis.

With respect to Mr. Worthington, he objects to the report of his speech as cited by me, and I am not disposed to question the correctness of his own version of it. I may, however, remark, that it would have been well if his correction had been earlier made public. I took his speech from *The Inquirer* of the 8th of October, 1864, whose editor copied it, with due acknowledgment, from *The Bolton Chronicle*, characterising it as an "admirable report." It has now been circulating for nearly a year and a half among the Unitarians of England and Ireland; it has been circulating in the town where the speech was delivered; it has been in the hands, doubtless, of many who heard it spoken; it has been circulating among the members of Mr. Worthington's own flock, and the other Christian Congregations in the place where he exercises his ministry; and it has been the subject of comment in the pages of this magazine. (*See* Vol. iii., pp. 325, &c.) Yet never till this hour have I heard of any repudiation from the pen of Mr. Worthington of the principle which it asserts as the foundation of the Church.

J. S. P.

RELIGION IN ITS OUTWARD AND SENSIBLE MANIFESTATIONS.

Amongst the several apostolic and other writers of the New Testament the Apostle John is undoubtedly to be distinguished as being the most *spiritually* disposed, whose mind was the least clogged by the outward and perishable

things of earth, and had the greatest tendency to dwell upon beautiful abstractions of the intellect and heart, and soar after the most exalted ideas and emotions of the soul, and to surround itself with an all-embracing atmosphere of spiritual and celestial love.

Yet it is especially worthy of remark, that in the emphatic words with which he opens his first epistle, wherein he lays the great foundations on which the structure is to rest, he appeals, not to inward abstractions of thought or feeling, how exalted or glorious soever, but to outward, visible, and substantial verities. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life. . . . That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

These words seem to us pointedly to illustrate the great truth that religion, its truths and duties, are not mere abstractions of the mind, airy creations of the fancy, subjects of exalted spiritualised thought, or wrapt inward contemplation; but are also outward and sensible things, tangible and substantial realities, manifesting themselves in various ways to our outward means of observation.

We do not mean that we can see and hear yet as the Apostles saw and heard him, that human eye can behold his Father and our Father, his God and our God. But we can see God in his works; our eyes can read in his holy word the sure record of the life, death, and resurrection of his Son, Jesus Christ; our feet can enter the threshold of the church and house of prayer; our hands can handle and our lips can taste the appointed memorials of the body and blood of the Lord.

It is thus that religion with its accompaniments, suits itself to the appointed conditions of humanity. It has its boundless field for the most spiritualised thought, its wide sphere for the play and exercise of the feelings and emotions; but, equally important to man, it has its innumerable objects addressed to the *senses*—the more immediate avenues of human perception—its forms and ceremonies, its churches, services, and devotions, its books and sacraments, its outward rites and duties, customs, habits, and observances.

We do not say that these last constitute religion, far

from it—for religion itself is a spiritual thing; but they are its adjuncts, its intended, and we believe its inseparable adjuncts, without which we are convinced that the loftier spiritual part alone would not long continue to exercise the faith, kindle the aspiration, and occupy the attention of men.

In saying this, we believe we are rather controverting views that are becoming very prevalent in the present day. It is now considered in many quarters as a sign of comparative mental cultivation and intellectual enlightenment to evince a disregard for the direct external evidences, and the outward observances connected with religion, to resolve it altogether into a kind of spiritual *nebula*, a cloud or atmosphere exalted far above the world and the senses, into which the mind may occasionally enter and there for a time abide, while the bodily part pursues its usual earthly calling, engaged in its daily round of worldly cares, business, or pleasures.

It is an opinion not confined to any special system or philosophic sect, but which we find now extensively to prevail amongst various denominations—our own as well as others—and through various degress of society more immediately around and about us, that the external observances of religion are comparatively worthless or obsolete, being either the invention of man to captivate the attention of childhood and ignorance, but unfitted to satisfy the intellect of the matured reasoner; or, if at first appointed by the founder of the Gospel system, that they were intended to serve rather as milk for the babe than as the strong meat needful to support the grown man. Religion in such instances (both in theory and practice) has come to be an intellectual gymnasium or discussion forum, in which to exercise the tongue and sharpen the wit, not the worship of the assembled church, or the prayer, "uttered or unexpressed," of humble and sinful man to his Father and his God.

In support of these views it is usual to run down and decry the value of the outward senses and their immediate perceptions, as organs for the reception of religious truths and impressions. Religion, it is said, is an inward and spiritual thing. What, then, can mere earthly sight, and hearing, and touch, for example, have to do with it? It

is, at best, a question between each man's soul and his God. What, then, can mere outward forms and observance, churches and sacraments, effect in the matter?

In proceeding to point out the one-sidedness and imperfection of these arguments, we at once admit the danger and the error to which the Christian Church is liable, and into which in all ages it has so deeply and grievously fallen, of *substituting* the outward, formal, and visible observances, rites, and demonstrations of religion for and instead of its inward and spiritual essence. This is the other extreme, likewise, to be shunned and deprecated. But while avoiding Scylla, it is no less destructive to fall into Charybdis. The senses and outward powers of perception and observation, and to these may be added the great though half instinctive influence of habit and custom,—why depreciate any of these, or refuse to assign to them their true and undoubted value? We never slight them so in regard to the concerns of this world. We freely allow the mind to act on the impressions they give us, believing them to be correct and true. We recognise the value of sight, for example, in enabling the mind to judge of the comparative value of merchandise in a place of trade, and profit by the knowledge it conveys. Why, then, may not the mind receive through the same organ pious and sanctifying impressions from witnessing the devout performance of some religious ordinance, and judge and profit by them also? How sweet to listen to the voice of birds! How inspiring to the heart the music or the eloquence of the human voice divine? Can the ear convey to the soul no spiritual impressions of heavenly value as it hearkens to the voice of prayer, or the united praises of the sanctuary?

How quickly and rejoicingly does the heart respond when the sense of touch recognises the cordial grasp of friendship! Does no thrill of holiest emotion pass into the soul when, reverently seated at the Redeemer's table, we take into our hands the bread and the cup, the memorials of his dying love? The power of habit in this world to influence the mind and actions is proverbial. It lessens the most arduous toil. It makes the "crooked straight and the rough places plain." When the long-accustomed feet of the habitual and pious frequenter of

God's house bear him to the sanctuary, is no corresponding consciousness of the value and blessings of religion likely to be impressed upon his mind?

The mistaken views to which we have been adverting will be best rectified by remembering the strangely complex organism with which we have been gifted, and with which we have to deal. Metaphysicians may exhaust themselves, and confuse their readers, with diverse and contradictory schemes of division and analysis; but still the senses continue as of yore to be the appointed organs of the mind.—the avenues to it and from it, both to young and old, to the man as to the child;—and who can sever what God hath joined? In religious, as in secular affairs, it is wronging, sinning against ourselves and our nature, and therefore against our Maker, to exercise and call into continual action any set of faculties and powers that belong to us, to the positive exclusion and detriment of others, whether it be the intellect, the heart, or the senses. They are all intended to work harmoniously together, mutually supporting, strengthening, and yet restraining each other with exquisitely balanced action. Force any one set into undue prominence and activity, and you destroy the equilibrium, ensure the whole system going astray, and take away any assurance of correctness and truth in their actions and conclusions. In fact, with the machinery working partially and wrongly, it is almost a necessary conclusion that the results must be partial and wrong also. See this fully exemplified in the several leading divisions of the Christian Church. Give the *senses* unlimited sway, at the expense of the intellect and the heart, and you have the natural result, in the outward and unprofitable show of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches. Let go the reins of the *emotions*, unregulated by mind or sense, and you fill the world with revival mania, and other forms of religious excitement and fanaticism. Force on the *intellect*, at the expense of *heart* and *sense*, and your would-be philosophers soon desert your churches, to discuss their rival theories and pass their brilliant witticisms in more congenial haunts, till the blankness of neology, the darkness of infidelity, the starvation and death of Atheism, stare you in the face.

We say not that it has yet gone so far, and God forbid it ever should! but it is this last *tendency* in society around us at present against which we believe it is incumbent on us all to be on our guard, the more especially so as it usually makes its first approaches in a very specious and beguiling garb, as Satan is said sometimes to clothe himself in the form of an angel of light, viz., assuming an anxiety for the cause of pure spiritual religion as distinguished from mere forms, and shows, and outward ceremonies and observances. All this seems and sounds well; but by little and little, with gathering force, the horns and the cloven hoof begin to make their appearance, until at length, casting aside concealment, the Prince of Darkness stands revealed in all the heaven-defying pride of his daring impiety.

But we are told to resist the devil and he will flee from us. And to do so successfully we must resist and avoid the very first beginning of evil. We must "not be high-minded, but fear," remembering the exhortation—"Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

We have always found it to be the case, that wherever the commanded *forms* and *observances* of religion are openly and habitually despised and disregarded, and spoken of with irreverence or contempt, there, whatever may be the pretext, very little, if any, of the religious *spirit* can be discovered, or is ever found to influence, or bear any fruits in the life and conduct. And are we not told, "By their fruits ye shall know them?" And, on the other hand, whenever the true *spirit* of Christianity is a present and prevailing influence, accompanied by that humility and self-distrust without which it cannot be genuine, there, also, are sure to be found the most earnest love and devout practice of its external observances and appointments, the spirit teaching its possessors to find in these the true and needful manifestations of its presence, the aids to its continuance, and the avenues to its holiest exercise.

C.

THE MOUNTAINS OF PALESTINE.

A Sunday School Lesson.—No. 2.

We are now to consider the mountains of the Holy Land —a subject of some importance to the right understanding of the sacred writings. Palestine may be accounted, on the whole, a mountainous country. It had high mountains on the north, and many considerable hills in the south and the east, together with a great number of these scattered through the length and breadth of the entire land. It has long been observed that the inhabitants of hilly countries are usually far more brave and much fonder of liberty than those people who live in large plains, and the reason is very obvious: Tribes of men are easily scattered and subdued in a level country; they can make little defence against their oppressors, whilst those who live among hills can retreat to their strongholds and can keep them against a very mighty power. The old inhabitants of Canaan were strong and fierce, and the Israelites would never have driven them out had not the arm of the Lord fought for them. Living long in Egypt —a level country and a land of slaves—these were slavish in their ideas and their habits, and hence they were very much afraid of the Canaanites, and would rather have gone back to Egypt than have advanced to attack the nations which dwelt in the Land of Promise. Moses told the people, whilst they were yet in the wilderness, that the land they were going in to possess was not like the land of Egypt, but a land of hills and valleys, and it was in all respects a very fruitful land, abounding with everything necessary for subsistence and comfort; the hills attracted the clouds and brought down abundance of rain, and the valleys were exceedingly fertile, bringing forth corn and grapes, sixty, yea a hundred fold.

Of all the mountains, the most celebrated was Lebanon, of which frequent mention is made in the Bible. We read of the cedars of Lebanon, and that Lebanon is not sufficient to burn before God—*i.e.*, its trees not enough for sacrifice to him. It was from Lebanon that Solomon procured the timber to build the Temple at Jerusalem. Lebanon is not a single mountain, but a chain, or rather chains, of mountains, named Libanus and Anti-Libanus,

with an extended and beautiful plain between, called Cœle Syria (the hollow Syria). Some of the peaks are very high—nearly two miles; and, though the country itself is very hot, snow is always found on the tops, and there it is piercingly cold. The cedars of Lebanon were large and stately trees, and very long-lived. A few of these cedars yet remain, though much decayed. Numbers of people live on the sides of Mount Lebanon, and the ground, we are told, is well cultivated by them. A branch of the Lebanon mountains running south is called Hermon. We read of the dew of Hermon, which is likened to the love which should be among all mankind as brethren.

Cæsarea Philippi was built near Mount Hermon, and it is very likely that on one of its hills, far away from the noise and strife of the world, our Lord was transfigured. It was on a high mountain, apart from the busy scenes of life.

Another celebrated and very beautiful hill was Mount Carmel, where Elijah offered sacrifice to God with the fire which came down from Heaven. Carmel is a promontory, or headland, running as it were into the sea. It is high, but the top is quite level, and it looks much like a cone or sugar loaf, with the sharp peak cut off. A fine view of the Mediterranean Sea, as well as of the surrounding country, is to be had from Mount Carmel, and it is well cultivated to its summit.

The Mount of Beatitudes is in Galilee, and it has this name, because it is pointed out as the hill on which our Lord sat when he delivered the sermon on the mount, and which commences with a number of beatitudes or blessings. It has nothing remarkable about it, but if it be the spot where Jesus thus preached to his disciples, we must regard it with the utmost veneration and interest.

Not far from the Mount of Beatitudes, and still in Galilee, is Mount Tabor, also celebrated as the supposed scene of the Saviour's transfiguration. It has already been said that most likely this great event took place on one of the Hills of Hermon, therefore Mount Tabor could not be the spot. Now on Tabor there was a Roman garrison, and we cannot for a moment suppose that our Lord, whose great object on this occasion was privacy, would have gone in the sight of so many idolatrous Roman soldiers. Tabor

is notwithstanding a high and beautiful hill, with a splendid prospect from the top. Very likely Jesus ascended it, and more than once, but we cannot believe he was transfigured there.

In Samaria were two hills mentioned in the Scriptures, Gerizim and Ebal. On Gerizim the blessings of the law were read by the Levites, and on Ebal, the curses against those who broke the law. The whole people of Israel stood in the valley between these hills, listening to the words, and answering "amen" to the sentence of the law. On Mount Ebal, Joshua built at this time an altar to God, and on Mount Gerizim the Samaritans long after built their temple; to it the woman who conversed with our Lord at the well of Sychar alluded, "Our fathers worshipped on this mountain."

In the Gospels we find repeated mention of the Mount of Olives. This was a hill near to Jerusalem, and on the eastern side of it, overlooking the city and the temple. Our Saviour was frequently on the Mount of Olives, and travelling over it from Jerusalem to Bethany, and back to the city. Bethany and Bethphage, as we have before seen, were villages on the eastern side of the Mount. Its name was derived from a number of olive trees which covered it. Most of these were cut down by Titus, the Roman general, and afterwards Emperor, at the dreadful siege of Jerusalem, forty years after our Lord's ascension into heaven; but some were left, and other trees grew up from the remains of the old ones. The Garden of Gethsemane, or of the wine-presses, was at the foot of the Mount of Olives, with the little brook Kedron near it. Some large olive trees yet mark this spot. It was from the Mount of Olives that Jesus spoke of the coming destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, and from a retired spot of it on the north-east side he went into heaven. A deep ravine lay between the Mount of Olives and Jerusalem.

Jerusalem was surrounded by hills; those to the north formed what was called the "hill country" of Judah. Mary the mother of Jesus went into this country just before the birth of her son Jesus, and to see her cousin Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist. The city itself was built on a hill, or hills; for there were Mount

Moriah, Mount Zion, with others. On Moriah the temple was built. Mount Zion, the highest of all, was on the south of the city, and it overlooked the valley of Gehenna, in which fires were continually burning to destroy the putrid offal of Jerusalem, and where worms continually fed on it. Hence our Lord speaks of the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is never quenched.

Mount Calvary, on which the Saviour of the world was crucified, was just outside the city boundaries. It was unlawful to put any one to death within the gate; our Lord suffered without the gate. Calvary is but a slight elevation, yet no doubt crosses erected on it could be seen from a distance. Golgotha, the place of a skull, must have been a particular part of Calvary. Some suppose it was rounded off in the shape of a human skull.

These are the most celebrated of the mountains of Palestine; their names are very familiar to us, and it is pleasant to know a little concerning them. There are others which, if time did not fail us, we might mention; but their general features are similar, and the remarks made on those already named may be extended to all the rest. One yet remains to be spoken of, not precisely within the limits of Palestine, yet so near as, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, to be fairly considered as belonging to the Land of Promise, Nebo, or Pisgah, from which Moses saw the future inheritance of his people, and near to which he died. This mountain is in the country of Moab, and on the north-eastern borders of the Dead Sea. It forms one of the Mountains of Abarim. Pisgah commanded a view of some points of Palestine; and Moses, though he was not suffered to go over the Jordan, was favoured with a sight of the country which for forty years he had in prospect, during his weary wanderings with his murmuring countrymen in the desert. We are told that "Moses went up unto the mountain of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah: and the Lord shewed him all the land of Gilead, unto Dan, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the utmost sea, and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar." Thus was the great lawgiver assured that his labours had not been in vain in the Lord, and

thus may we, our earthly pilgrimage over, stand and look towards our heavenly inheritance, and see with our eyes, as he saw, what great thing the Lord hath provided for us.

"Could we but climb where Moses stood,
And view the landscape o'er,
Not Jordan's stream, nor death's cold flood,
Should fright us from the shore."

B.

INTELLIGENCE.

REMONSTRANT CONGREGATON OF DUNMURRY AND THE LATE REV. DR. MONTGOMERY.

The following is a copy of the minutes of the proceedings of a Committee consisting of the entire Congregation of the Remonstrant Presbyterians of Dunmurry, held 24th December, 1865:—

"It having pleased God in his inscrutable providence to remove from us by death the dearly beloved pastor who has for 56 years laboured in this Congregation, and endeared himself to each of us by so many ties of love and affection; we wish to record, in the minute book of the Congregation, our sense of his inestimable worth, and our full appreciation of his character both as a friend and a Christian minister, and to express how deeply we deplore his irreparable loss."

"Resolved—That a copy of this minute, together with the following letter of condolence, be sent to Mrs. Montgomery:—

"'Dunmurry, *24th December*, 1865.

"'Dear Madam,—We, the members of the Remonstrant Congregation of Dunmurry, cannot allow the bereavement which has so recently befallen you, in the loss of your beloved husband, our revered pastor, to pass without conveying to you and your daughter, Miss Montgomery, our warmest sympathy and condolence.

"'Words are too weak to express the sorrow we feel for the loss of one, the memory of whose worth is so entwined round our hearts, and in whom each of us can truly say he ever found a guide, counsellor, and friend; we feel how vain would be the hope that he can ever be replaced to us. Such being the feelings of those to whom he was only bound by the ties of friendship, we feel the more deeply what the bereavement must be to his own family and kindred, and how irreparable in this world must be his loss to them, and the desolation which must seize their hearts, when they look upon the now vacant seat by the once cheerful hearth, and miss the kindly tones of the loved voice, now hushed in the silence of the grave. All we can say to alleviate such grief as yours, must, we feel, be useless, and we can only pray that God in his mercy will give you strength to bear your affliction, and enable you to say, with Christian resignation, 'Thy will, not ours, be done.' Believe, dear Madam, that we shall ever feel for you and your amiable family the warmest friendship and esteem.—Signed on behalf of the Congregation,

"'John Roberts, *Chairman*.'"

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION AND THE REV. DR. MONTGOMERY.

At a meeting of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, held January 9th, 1866, Edward J. Nettlefold, Esq., in the chair, the resolution that follows, proposed by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, seconded by Rev. Thomas Madge, supported by Alfred Lawrence, Esq., and others, was unanimously adopted:—

That the members of this committee have heard with deep regret of the death of the Rev. Henry Montgomery, LL.D., of Dunmurry. That calling to their recollection the important and brilliant services he rendered in defending the rights of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and also the valuable help which he gave in this country, especially by his counsel and great influence with some of our leading statesmen, in preparing the way for the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act; and also remembering his various other services to the cause of truth and freedom, as a most able and zealous minister of Christ, this committee desire publicly to express their sorrow at the loss of so able a champion of their cause, a sorrow heightened to many of them by their recollection of his personal excellence, and his genial temper and manners.

That a copy of this resolution be signed by the President and Officers of the Association, and forwarded to Mrs. Montgomery.

JEROM MURCH, *President.*
EDWARD J. NETTLEFOLD, *Chairman of the Committee.*

JAMES HEYWOOD,
THOMAS MADGE,
WILLIAM LAWRENCE, M.P.
CHRIS. J. THOMAS,
JAMES CLARKE LAWRENCE,
Vice-Presidents.
JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A.,
HENRY IERSON, M.A.,
ALFRED LAWRENCE,
WALTER C. VENNING, *Treasurer.*
R. BROOK ASPLAND, *Secretary.*

The following is the letter of the Secretary of the Association, the Rev. R. B. Aspland, in forwarding the resolution:—

"*British and Foreign Unitarian Association Office,*
178, *Strand, London, Jan.* 29, 1866.

"DEAR MADAM,—I am instructed to forward to you the accompanying resolution of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and to assure you of their profound sympathy with you, in the loss of your excellent and gifted husband. The resolution was voted unanimously. Allow me to explain that the delay in transmitting the resolution has arisen from the necessity of sending the document to the several gentlemen whose signatures are attached, some of whom live in the country.

"Permit me to add the expression of my individual sympathy with you and every member of your bereaved family. I honour the memory of the late Dr. Montgomery profoundly. I took an

early opportunity of expressing from the pulpit the feelings excited by his death, and the gratitude and veneration due to his memory from the Unitarians both of Ireland and England. It will be long before we shall see his equal in our ranks; and never were men like him more needed.—I am, dear Madam, most respectfully and truly yours,

" R. Brook Aspland, *Secretary*.

" Mrs. Montgomery."

HOME MISSIONARY BOARD, MANCHESTER.

On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, January 15, 16, and 17, the Annual Public Examination of the students of this Institution took place in the Memorial Hall, recently erected. During the three days there was an unusually large attendance of visitors. The proceedings were brought to a close on Wednesday afternoon by the Visitors' Address, delivered by the Rev. Henry Green, of Knutsford, and by the distribution of prizes. Mr. Green, in the course of his address, said—"I claim no fellowship with the great parties which divide the modern Christian world; I am of the old school—neither an Attitudinarian, to bend, and bow, and cross myself, as if religion consisted in a species of spiritual gymnastics—nor a Latitudinarian, to suppose that the more I could doubt, the truer would be my creed, and that I might become a Christian simply by believing in all unbelief." Referring to the new and commodious building in which they met, and which had just been completed for the use of the Board, he said—"This fair hall in which we meet is, we trust, the earnest that, as its foundations have been laid in righteousness and the love of truth, so its goings forward will be in the increase of Christian knowledge, of zeal for human welfare, and of the true missionary's desire, as the fields ripen for harvest, to see sent forth labourers into the harvest. One great privilege we possess as brethren of the free spirit of God—and thankful enough for it we cannot be to our Heavenly Father—it is that our teachers here are untrammelled by a fealty, sworn or promised, to any human system; their engagement is like one of old—To read in the law of God distinctly, and to give the sense, and to cause the people to understand the reading." He combated, at some length, the objection often made to the curriculum of the Missionary Board as being defective, and concluded by stating, that "sound instruction and diligent learning are here combined, and warrant the hopeful feeling, that when our young men actually take up the prophet's work, it will be to feed their people with sound wisdom, in the fear of God and in fellowship with Christ's word and Spirit."

The prizes were then distributed, and the Principal gave certificates to the students who are completing their course, addressing a few suitable remarks of encouragement to each; after which the proceedings were closed with prayer.

On Wednesday evening, after the conclusion of the examinations, the usual dedicatory service was held in Cross Street Chapel. The Rev. Dr. Sadler delivered a most impressive address to the students, who, having completed their course, are about to enter on the ministry.

The Annual Meeting was held at the Memorial Hall on Monday

evening, Benjamin Heape, Esq., in the chair. The Report, which was read by the Rev. J. Drummond, was highly satisfactory. It appears from it, that, in the course of the year, six students had been admitted.

OPENING OF THE MEMORIAL HALL, MANCHESTER.

On Thursday evening, January 18, upwards of 750 persons assembled to witness the formal opening of this building. After tea, the whole of the company adjourned to the large room, which, with all the galleries, was completely filled. The chair was occupied by the Rev. W. Gaskell. After the singing of a hymn composed for the occasion, in which all present joined, the chairman delivered an eloquent address. Mr. Ivie Mackie, who had been the largest contributor to the building fund, also addressed the meeting; after which a solemn dedication prayer was offered up by the Rev. Dr. Beard. Mr. Gaskell then resigned the chair to William Rathbone, jun., Esq., the President of the Home Missionary Board. Speeches were delivered by the president, by S. Greg, Esq.; Rev. B. Herford, Rev. Dr. Sadler, Mr. R. Shipman, Revs. D. Matts and J. Drummond. In the course of the evening Mr. John Dendy, B.A., on behalf of some of the old students of Manchester New College, presented a copy of the *Codex Sinaiticus* to Dr. Beard, as principal of the Home Missionary Board, expressing, at the same time, an earnest hope that the students of both institutions should always have a kind word and a helping hand for each other.

BIRMINGHAM DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The fifth annual meeting of this Association was held on Monday, February 12th, in the Lecture-room of the old Meeting-house, the Rev. D. Maginnis, of Stourbridge, in the chair. Mr. J. W. Oliver read the report of the Council, the leading feature of which was that it recommended the merging of the Association in the Midland Christian Union, a society which was recently formed out of the old Warwickshire Tract Society, and which has for its object "the promotion of the interests of Christianity in connection with the freedom which rejects subscription to any articles of theological belief." A resolution was moved and seconded, to the effect that the Birmingham District Unitarian Association be merged in the Midland Christian Union. A long discussion followed respecting the propriety of dropping the name "Unitarian," after which the resolution was put to the meeting and carrried *nem. con.*

MONTREAL UNITARIAN CHURCH AND THE REV. JOHN CORDNER.

The Rev. J. Cordner having, with the concurrence of his congregation, accepted an urgent invitation from New Orleans to preach there for the next three months, and endeavour to reconstitute the Unitarian Church which existed there before the breaking out of the war, the annual meeting of the Sunday-School was held on January 9th, somewhat earlier than usual, for the purpose of bidding him farewell, and wishing him God speed on his mission.

Besides the children, about 300 of the Congregation were present. After tea, Mr. Cordner delivered a feeling address to the younger members of his flock. He then distributed, as prizes, more than fifty carefully selected books, accompanying each with a few appropriate words. An affectionate address was then presented to Mr. Cordner from the Congregation, to which he replied, referring to the object of his mission to New Orleans, and thanking his friends for their generous sympathy. After singing and the benediction, all present took leave of their pastor, wishing him a pleasant journey and a safe return.

PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

The following letter from the Rev. J. C. Woods, minister of the Unitarian Church in Adelaide, which we copy from *The London Inquirer*, contains gratifying intelligence respecting the Unitarian cause in the colony:—

"I have pleasure in informing you that, on last Sunday, Dec. 24, I opened at Shady Grove, near Huhndorf, about twenty-three miles from Adelaide, a large and well built room for the worship of one God, the Father. There was an attendance of over sixty people in the neighbourhood—which is a very thinly populated one—and my choir from Adelaide; and several members of the congregation in the city came too, being more than forty in number. So the room, which seats one hundred comfortably, was finally filled, though our Adelaide friends were rather late, having lost themselves in the woods. I dedicated the room to the service of God, and dedicated also two children. The people were very attentive to my sermon. An Adelaide friend, William Kay, Esq., had the order of service printed—the hymns and psalms in full; and I took for distribution a number of my own publications, and a large quantity of excellent tracts which I had received from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. At the close of the service, Francis Duffield, Esq., of Cobden Grange, announced that, with the aid he could get from Adelaide, he would undertake to have service there every Sunday, to which several people uttered a fervent Amen. So we have now two Unitarian Christian churches in South Australia. This room at Shady Grove, with a cemetery and several acres of land, is the gift to the Unitarians of Mr. John Monks.

"Our Sunday-school in Adelaide is flourishing, and I have established a mutual improvement class, which is well attended, and excites some interest, and I hope will do good. There are annual Christmas readings at the South Australian Institute, and this year I was requested to give the opening address. There was a great crowd, and the Dean was on the platform, while the leading Presbyterian minister here gave two recitations. There are cases of books for me, sent by friends at Belfast, Staleybridge, and London, in ships arrived at Port Adelaide, but I have not yet got them. I hope to acknowledge them specially by next mail.—Yours truly,

"J. Crawford Woods."

MONTHLY SUMMARY OF INTELLIGENCE.

On Sunday evening, January 28, the Rev. David Matts, of the Home Missionary Board, was ordained pastor of the Free Christian Church, Oxton, near Birkenhead, in the presence of a large congregation. The services were conducted by the Revs. J. Beard, D.D., W. James, and C. B. Upton.

The congregation of Oakfield-road Church, Bristol, have invited the Rev. J. E. Carpenter, B.A., of Manchester New College, to the pastorate of the Church. Mr. Carpenter is son of Dr. W. B. Carpenter, and grandson to Dr. Lant Carpenter, formerly pastor of Lewin's Mead Congregation, Bristol.

On January 2, the teachers and scholars of King Edward Street Sunday Schools, Macclesfield, held their annual tea-meeting, and embraced the opportunity of giving a cordial welcome to their new minister, the Rev. T. F. Thomas, recently of Newport, Isle of Wight, and formerly minister of the Eustace Street Congregation, Dublin.

On January 18, the Annual Conference of old students of the Home Missionary Board was held in the Memorial Hall, Manchester. An address was delivered by the Rev. W. Binns, President; officers were appointed for the ensuing year, and a paper was read by the Rev. H. Eachus, on the uses of the Bible in public worship.

At a numerously attended meeting of the Committee of the Association of Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland, held on Feb. 23, in the vestry of the Second Meeting-house, Belfast—the Rev. J. S. Porter, President, in the chair—petitions to the two Houses of Parliament were adopted in support of the principle of united and non-sectarian education, and in opposition to the contemplated changes in the charter of the Queen's University.

ERRATA.—In the February number, lines 9 and 10, p. 24, should read as follows:—"The voice of God is heard throughout the Old Testament amidst the habitations of men."

The Rev. J. P. Hopps, in his letter, to which we referred in p. 29, says that it was not Mr. Clayden who asked Mr. Martineau, but Mr. Bache who asked the Unitarian Association, for a definition of Unitarianism.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The letter of Mr. Robert M'Calmont shall appear in our next; also, the letter of "B. C.," on Remonstrant Principles.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] APRIL, 1866. [No. 3.

RELIGIOUS TRACTS AND IRRELIGIOUS TRASH.

WHAT an amazing power the printing-press has wielded for the spread of knowledge! It has brought within the reach of all classes the treasures of science and the truths of religion; it has materially lessened the importance of the lecture-room, and has even superseded to some extent the necessity of the pulpit. While "to the making of books," in a sense which Solomon never dreamed of, "there is no end," and treatises on the most interesting and most abstruse subjects may be purchased for a small sum, knowledge has, through the agency of tracts, been still more widely circulated, and has penetrated to the lowest depths of society. By means of tracts, published at little more than a nominal price, the humblest of the community have been introduced to the literary works and the scientific triumphs of the past age and of the present; and thus they have contributed to the enjoyment and the improvement of "the million." Tracts afford an easy means of reaching the masses, and speedily instructing them on any subject to which public attention is directed. Of this fact the history of the Anti-Corn Law agitation affords a striking proof. Through the indomitable energy and the munificent liberality of a few earnest-minded men, tracts exhibiting, in a simple and striking form, the leading arguments for a repeal of the Corn Laws were scattered broadcast over the Three Kingdoms, and materially helped to build up the public opinion which demanded and obtained Free Trade. By means of tracts the Temperance Question has been much assisted; millions of them, issued by several temperance organizations, have exhibited to old and young the evils which drink has brought, and is still bringing, on mankind, and have furnished them with arguments, religious,

moral, medical, and economic, in support of temperance. So it has been with regard to the question of health, to which many philanthropic and enlightened men have latterly given their attention. By means of tracts, much important practical information on sanitary matters has been disseminated, and thus something has been done—more, we trust, will soon be done—to prevent disease and promote health.

But it is chiefly in the cause of morality and religion that tracts and tract distribution have been employed; and here they have, we doubt not, exercised a wide and elevating influence. They have been happily described as "silent missionaries," which often speak to the mind and conscience of those whom no living voice could reach, and sow in their hearts seeds of spiritual truth and holiness which, in good time, may yield precious fruit. Some of these tracts are doctrinal and controversial, some are merely moral, while others present religion in its simplest and most practical form, much as the Saviour himself exhibited it, without touching on those questions of theology which have divided churches. Each of these classes of tracts is useful in its place. Thinking minds cannot ignore the leading theological questions. They cannot, for example—or, at all events, they should not—say to themselves, "Some think Christ is God, and should be worshipped as God; others think that he is, in his highest dignity, only the well-beloved Son of God; but I shall not trouble myself about the question, it does not concern me." It concerns every Christian most materially and directly; for, according to the view he holds on this subject, his devotions are of one character or another. It determines the being to whom he shall pray. Nor can any intelligent persons, of serious mind, say with themselves, "Theologians disagree about the nature and extent of the Atonement; but it is a matter about which I do not trouble myself—the question is of no practical importance." It is of the utmost practical importance what character we ascribe to God; whether we regard him as, in the overflowing of his love, sending his Son to win men everywhere to goodness; or whether we consider God, for sake of mankind, or, as some think, of a few of them only, pouring out his wrath on an innocent being.

And while such questions are pressed on the attention of Christians, at least in all Protestant Churches,—and the very diversity of sects is an evidence of diversity of opinion,—the doctrinal tracts which have been published present, in a concise form, the arguments from Scripture and from reason on which the differing bodies rest their opposing views. If there is any one of ordinary intelligence who desires to form an opinion on any of these disputed points, we would recommend him to select, from any of our Unitarian Societies, a tract on the Unitarian side, and from any Trinitarian Association a tract on the opposite side, and to read them with as much care and impartiality as he can; referring to the Scriptures themselves, in order more clearly to apprehend the meaning of the texts quoted, and to his own common sense to measure the force of the several arguments, and form his judgment accordingly.

Some of the tracts circulated by philanthropic and religious societies are moral, and aim at inculcating those moral duties which we owe to our neighbours and to ourselves. The importance of these it is difficult to exaggerate, as they help to strengthen the foundations of society, and to counteract the undermining influences of avarice and other prevailing sins; and it is a sign of healthy life in any association—Roman Catholic or Protestant, High Church or Dissenting—when it aims, through the agency of tracts and leaflets widely distributed, to enforce those important moral obligations which are equally recognized by men of all churches and men of no church.

But other tracts, and these certainly not the least instructive, are essentially "religious," seeking to awaken, and keep alive in the heart, piety to God and faith in Christ, out of which flow the holiest affections which can animate the heart and beautify the life. A man may be "moral," in the ordinary sense of the term, and yet have no devout sentiments,—indeed have no belief in a God at all. There are living in these lands some who maintain a respectable character for sobriety, honesty, truthfulness, and generosity, and yet have no belief in a personal God, and no faith in any life beyond the grave. Christianity aims at placing the soul in communion with its Creator,

and reconciling human children to their heavenly Parent; and a large number of the tracts issued by the Religious Tract Society, and by smaller societies of a similar kind, are admirably written, contain little to offend the theological tenets of any Christian, and appeal with much force to the spiritual faculties; circulated through the agency of Sunday Schools, Domestic Missions, and Tract Societies, they have done much to enlighten the mind and to impress the heart, to bring peace to the penitent, solace to the mourning, and comfort to the sick and the dying. Largely instrumental to these blessed ends was for many years the Christian Tract Society; and many of the publications which it issued, both in the earlier and the later years of its existence, are among the best of the religious tracts which our language contains. But not to one or two associations are such improving publications limited. Thanks to the combined results of cheap printing and Christian zeal, these "missionaries" of holiness and love, of piety and faith, are found in dwellings of the poorest, the most wretched, and the most wicked. They are freely supplied to every class of the community, and if only one in a hundred, or even one in a thousand, should drop its seed of heavenly truth into the heart of the reader, the good which they would accomplish is incalculable.

No doubt, when so many tracts are scattered abroad by various denominations, there will be found in them, at times, marks of the peculiar tenets of the churches which prepare them. Thus we find in those published in connexion with the Church of Rome, references to legends and traditions, which tend to disfigure them, and add nothing to the instruction they contain; and in those published by that branch of the English Church, commonly known as "High Church," there are allusions to church authority and ritual observances, as well as an occasional sneer at Dissent, which might better be omitted; but, despite of these blemishes, they are good, and are calculated to promote the cause of religion. There is, however, a class of tracts which is very different, and to which we referred in the heading of this article, under the designation of "Irreligious Trash," and as the distributors of these publications are "legion," it is the more needful that their pernicious tendency should be exposed.

The doctrine which is most prominently inculcated in them is the danger and folly of human efforts after improvement. Man, it would appear, can do nothing, and should do nothing. One of these tracts which we lately saw is entitled "The Sin of Striving," and the object is to show that men can never become Christians till they cease to strive! A tract more commonplace in style, more unreasonable in argument and illustration, or more irreligious in its tendency, we have never read. Whence the view which it advocates is derived, we cannot imagine. The class of religionists that hold it do not attach any value to tradition, else we might suppose they had drawn it from some old superstition. No such doctrine certainly is taught by our Lord. On the contrary, he urges men to exert themselves, and deny themselves, that they may follow him. We wonder what commentary these enthusiasts would give us of Christ's words—"Strive to enter in at the strait gate," or those emphatic words of John—"He that doeth righteousness is righteous." A similar doctrine is taught in many of the tracts which, in certain localities, are left in every cottage and scattered freely on the wayside. Here is a copy of a leaflet of tinted paper which is before us, neatly printed and got up in a style worthy of something better. The heading is "What must I do to be Saved?" and the following is the answer:—

Nothing either great or small,—
Nothing, sinner, no;
Jesus did it, did it all,
Long, long ago.

When He, from his lofty throne,
Stooped to do and die,
Everything was fully done;
Hearken to his cry,—

"It is finished." Yes, indeed,
Finished every jot:
Sinner, this is all you need;
Tell me, is it not?

Weary, working, plodding one,
Wherefore toil you so?
Cease your doing, all was done,
Long, long ago.

Till on Jesus you rely,
By a simple faith,
Doing is a deadly thing;
Doing ends in death.

Cast your deadly doing down—
Down at Jesus' feet;
Stand in him—in him alone—
Gloriously complete.

How those who accept the doctrine embodied in the foregoing doggerel can reconcile it with Scripture, for which, we freely admit, they cherish the deepest reverence, we are at a loss to conceive. If it were in accordance with Scripture, and agreeable to common sense, which Scripture, properly interpreted, never can contradict, it would be pleasant enough, we admit; but as it is, it is only fitted for weak and fanatical minds, and, if generally received, would operate most injuriously on society. Men, and women too, in every age of the Christian Church, have sought some easy way—some "royal road"—to heaven. In the mind of some, connexion with "the true Church" is the only safe course; to others, the equally easy course which is here recommended—the one resting on superstition, the other on fanaticism; but Christianity is opposed alike to fanaticism and superstition, and requires of all its disciples earnest, continued, and prayerful efforts to follow Christ and do the will of God. The Master exhorts us to strive, to watch, to work: the whole tenour of his teaching goes to urge and enforce active righteousness, and to discountenance the sentimentalism which these tracts would substitute for Christian working. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." And in the writings of the Apostles, we find similar exhortations to practical religion. Everywhere in the Christian Scriptures the necessity of earnest effort and the value of practical goodness are clearly exhibited; and, therefore, tracts which discourage "doing," and denounce "the sin of striving," are certainly nothing better than irreligious trash.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 50.)

IV.—JOHN ANDERSON (1671—1685) occupies the fourth place on the roll of the Presbyterian Ministers of Glenarm. His incumbency there continued for fourteen years; and concerning the method of its commencement, as well as some of his own antecedents, we have original and authentic information in the minutes of the Antrim Meeting, which fortunately, just at this date, become available. The first entry which they exhibit on this subject is as follows:—

"1671, *July* 4.—AT BALLYCLARE. Mr. P. Adair, Moderator, reported, that according to the last day's appointment he went to Glenarm, and after conference with the people there, he finds them unanimous in their invitation to Mr. John Anderson, one of the ejected ministers in Scotland, to reside amongst them, and exercise his ministry for a time. The meeting, considering that the said Mr. John had recommendations to some brethren here from Mr. George Hutchison and Mr. Ralph Rodgers, wherewith the meeting were satisfied, and he being present here this day, and the desire of the people put to him, he took it to advise, till the next meeting, and in the meantime, the brethren appoint him to continue preaching there till that time."

At the next meeting, Mr. Adair, who was then minister of the adjoining Parish of Cairncastle, again reported to the brethren that the people of Glenarm persisted in their desire for Mr. Anderson to settle with them, and exercise his ministry amongst them for a time. On this occasion, also, Mr. Anderson was present, and being once more appealed to for his decision in the matter, he "consented to this desire of the people of Glenarm for the time, declaring himself, however, to be still a minister of the Church of Scotland, having relation to a particular flock there, from which he was violently thrust, and that this consent might not be made use of to his prejudice, when it should please the Lord to open a door to him to go back." With this declaration the brethren were satisfied, and at the same time, granted the request which Mr. Anderson then made, that he might have leave to go to Scotland for a little, "resolving to return and stay with that people" in Glenarm. This he

did, and on January 2, 1672, Mr. P. Adair, of Cairncastle is "appointed to go to Glenarm, on a week day, so soon as his health permits, and preach there, and see what duty the people there does to Mr. Anderson;" *i.e.*, how they contribute towards their minister's maintenance and support. At the same meeting, the brethren thinking fit that a constant clerk should be appointed to record their proceedings, did nomínate Mr. John Anderson to that office for a year, and fixed his fees at half-a-crown for each Parish or Congregation. But I fear that, notwithstanding the friendly offices of Mr. Adair, and the addition to Mr. Anderson's income arising from the clerk's fees, the pecuniary position of the latter minister at Glenarm was not, at this period, very comfortable. Indeed the same was then the case with most of the Presbyterian ministers in this neighbourhood. And so bad, in this respect, did matters at length become, that towards the end of 1673 the brethren, in order, if possible, to check the growing evil, were obliged to take the steps indicated in the following minute, wherein it will be observed that the Congregation of Glenarm occupies a position of not very creditable prominence:—

"1673, *October* 14.—At Larne. The brethren taking to their serious consideration the conditions of several of their ministers, that they are much neglected by their Congregations as to their maintenance, do now resolve to lay out themselves in their serious endeavours to get the same remedied, so far as they may be able; in pursuance of which design it is concluded that a brother or two be appointed to visit each Congregation, and to take account of their performances to their respective ministers; the which brother or brethren so appointed is to write beforehand to the parish he or they are to visit, signifying to the parish his or their appointment and purpose to come to them about that affair, and desiring them to have accounts there for facilitating the visitation work; their diligence to be reported to this meeting. The Parish of Glenarm is appointed to signify to next meeting what duty, in effort of a maintenance, it has done to its minister, of which it is to be advertised, and visited in manner above mentioned, by Mr. John Shaw."

The mission to Glenarm of Mr. Shaw, who was minister of Ahoghill, appears to have been somewhat more successful than had been the previous visit of Mr. P. Adair, to whom, indeed, as being their near neighbour, the Glenarm people had apparently learned to turn an inattentive ear. At the next meeting, (November 11, 1673),

"Mr. Shaw reported, concerning Glenarm, that he had been with the people of that place according to appointment, and that he had had some good measure of satisfaction of their dutifulness to Mr. Anderson in the matter of a maintenance, and also produced a letter from them, wherein they promised to send one of their number to the next meeting, with a more full account." Accordingly, on January 4, 1674, at a meeting held in Larne, appeared John Abernethy,* from the Parish of Glenarm, and gave a clear account how things stood between them and Mr. Anderson. The quota of stipend they had promised him was Thirty Pounds a year. This was a sad falling off from the Sixty Pounds a year with a manse and glebe, which had been settled on his predecessor, Mr. Fleming; but it is stated in the minutes to be "the ordinary allowance a minister in this country gets at this time." Of this Thirty Pounds a year, Mr. Abernethy reports that the Glenarm people "are not much in arrear" with their minister, and that "they are in a promising way of satisfying him;" but whether they actually did so or not cannot now be known, for at this point occurs the lamentable gap in the minute-book of the Antrim Meeting to which I have already more than once alluded, and which leaves us without any authentic information concerning the Congregation of Glenarm, until we come to December 2, 1684. At this latter date we have the first of a long series of entries connected with the removal of Mr. Anderson from Glenarm to Antrim, which finally took place in November, 1685. The Congregation of Antrim had been without a minister ever since the death of Mr. Thomas Gowan, in September, 1683, and on some of the brethren going there towards the end of 1684, and "discoursing the honourable family" of Clotworthy concerning a successor, it appeared that Mr. John Anderson of Glenarm was the person pitched on to fill Mr. Gowan's vacant pulpit. Accordingly, commissioners were sent from Antrim to the meeting held on December 2, 1684, to urge Mr. Anderson's "transportation." Strange to say,

* Whether this John Abernethy of Glenarm was any relative to his namesake, the eminent author and divine, who was minister in Antrim and Dublin successively, I cannot say. Perhaps he was. Another minister of the same name had been ejected in 1661 from Minterburn, in County Tyrone.

Mr. Anderson himself strongly objected to the contemplated change, and did so with evident sincerity. His flock in Glenarm also opposed his "transportation," and on several occasions, through their commissioners, John Mitchell* and John Stuart, gave in their reasons against it; but after deliberating on the matter for nearly twelve months, and after consulting all the other meetings on the subject, the Antrim Meeting finally disannexed Mr. Anderson from Glenarm, and ordered his removal to Antrim, by the following minute, which no Presbyterian minister in those days would have dared to disobey :—

"1685, *November* 3.—At Templepatrick. Appears Robert Harper,† commissioner from Glenarm. This affair of Mr. Anderson's transportation being reasoned *pro* and *con*, the meeting considering the whole without any partiality, and calling on God for light and direction in the determination of the matter, have declared their judgment to their brother, Mr. John Anderson, that as at their appointment he has served in Glenarm as their minister these fourteen years, with a reserve of his relation to his Congregation in Scotland, they, finding it necessary to have the Congregation of Antrim supplied, after so long a desolation, and that there is no other expedient for the time appearing to get the same effectuated, they are free to clear him of that former appointment, in reference to Glenarm, and to advise and appoint him to exercise his ministry in the Parish of Antrim, still there being a reserve of his relation to the Church of Scotland."

This resolution, which, it will be seen, peremptorily terminated Mr. Anderson's ministry in Glenarm, was ordered to be communicated to that congregation by Mr. W. Adair, who was then minister of Ballycaston, but who, a few years afterwards, succeeded Mr. Anderson in

* The Mitchell Family were connected by marriage with the Donelsons of Glenarm, and, like them, once owned considerable property in this neighbourhood, including Greenland and Ballycraigy, in the Parish of Larne; and Miniss and the Droagh, in the Parish of Cairncastle. The former was granted for lives renewable for ever to Hugh Mitchell, by a deed from the Earl of Antrim, dated June 1, 1745. The latter was granted in fee to William Mitchell, "then of Dickeystown, gentleman," by a deed from the same nobleman, dated December 14, 1737. The Mitchell family is now locally extinct.

† The Harper Family owned a small estate near Cairnlough, which was called after them, "Harphall"—a designation which it still retains,—and which, after passing successively to and from the hands of proprietors called respectively M'Cutcheon and Brown, is now mostly possessed by Mr. W. Orr, Solicitor, of Ballymena. These Harpers were connected with the late Doctor M'Donnell of Belfast, and with the present Montgomerys of Benvarden. The family is now extinct.

Antrim.* Concerning Mr. Anderson's ministry in Glenarm, I have nothing more to add, except the conjecture—for there is no record on the subject,—that in his time was probably built the first meeting-house in Glenarm, which stood somewhat nearer to the Parish Church than does the present meeting-house, which was erected in 1762.

V.—Hugh Crawford (1685—1688) was Mr. Anderson's immediate successor in Glenarm. Like his predecessor, he was a Scotch minister, who, having been ejected from his parish in Scotland, came to Ireland, where he accepted the temporary and conditional charge of a congregation; but again, in 1688 (also like his predecessor), left Ireland and returned to his native country to avoid "the troubles of the times." Mr. Crawford's connexion with the Congregation of Glenarm was very short. Altogether, it extended over only three years; and for a considerable part of even that brief period, he seems to have been only constant supplier. His name does not appear on the roll of ministers of the Antrim meeting until the middle of 1687, and therefore it is probable that this was the date of his actual settlement in Glenarm. Very soon, indeed, after Mr. Anderson's transportation to Antrim, viz., in January 1686, and in consequence of a supplication for supplies which was presented on that day by Mr. Gideon Donnelson, Commissioner from Glenarm, "Mr. Hugh Crawford was appointed ordinarily to supply the people, with his conveniency, when the meeting can't get it done, and that people desire him." This he apparently did, in conjunction with other ministers, until May, 1686, when Mr. William Halliday appeared as Commissioner from Glenarm, "to supplicate the meeting to advise them about being replanted with a Gospel ministry, and withal privately signify that their eye is upon Mr. Hugh Crawford, with whom the meeting has privately signified their approbation." But several things occurred to delay the

* Mr. Anderson stayed only three years in Antrim. He returned to Scotland in 1688, "on account of the troubles of the times," and his name is mentioned in 1691, as being minister of Aughtergaven, in North Britain, which was probably his original parish, and where, in all likelihood, he died.

settlement. In the first place, the Glenarm people seem to have been very remiss in the payment of Mr. Anderson's stipend during the latter years of that gentleman's ministry amongst them. The quota promised by them was only Thirty Pounds a year; but it appears that when Mr. Anderson left them they were in debt to him more than £120, *i.e.*, more than four years' stipend, of which sum I fear he never recovered much, although his brethren did everything for him that they possibly could. In the next place, small as had been Mr. Anderson's stipend, the sum which the Glenarm people at first proposed to pay to Mr. Hugh Crawford was much smaller, being only £20 a year. This "little quota, as well as their utter carelessness of Mr. Anderson's arrears, the meeting resented, and appointed Messrs. Hall, of Larne, and Campbell, of Cairncastle, to deal with them and stir them up;" which those brethren did to some little purpose, so far as the stipend offered to Mr. Crawford was concerned, for with much difficulty they got it raised from £20 to £24 a year. But when they spoke to the Glenarm people about Mr. Anderson's arrears, they were sagely told that it was "not convenient now to meddle with both at once, lest both should be marred." Still, although the people of Glenarm could not afford to be just, they could affect to be generous; for, at the very time when they practically repudiated their debt of £120 to their former minister, and even allowed themselves to be craved more than once for two years' fees to the Clerk of Presbytery, amounting to Five Shillings, which they had let fall into arrear, they could yet send "Twenty Shillings for the reparation of Inniskilling." At length, however, having increased their offer of stipend (as above stated) to £24 a year, and Mr. Crawford's call having been "sent back to Glenarm, that Mr. Donnelson might sign it, who was most forward for Mr. Crawford's settlement there; and Mr. John Donnelson and his eldest son having signed the call to Mr. Crawford," the meeting concurred in the settlement, and in January, 1687, presented the call to Mr. Crawford before the Commissioner from Glenarm, Mr. John Mitchell.* Mr. Crawford took

* Messrs. William and Robert Mathy (see *Christian Unitarian*, iv. 263), Joseph Boyd, Robert Montgomery, Henry Dunn, John

some months to consider about his acceptance, during which time the brethren made repeated attempts to induce the Glenarm Congregation to augment their quota of stipend, but all in vain; and therefore, on the promise of £24 a year, Mr. Crawford, was in April, 1687, settled in Glenarm. After such an introduction, the reader will not be surprised to hear that he did not stay there long. Scarcely was he fixed in his Irish Congregation, until the meeting, more than once, had to call upon "Glenarm to give account of Mr. Anderson's arrears, and also how matters are with Mr. Hugh Crawford." In both cases I fear the response was not favourable, for soon afterwards we have the following minute, which concludes the history of Mr. Crawford's connexion with the Congregation of Glenarm:—

"1688, *February.*—At Templepatrick. Mr. Hugh Crawford having excused this and his former absence by reason of his sickness, by a line whereby he also signified his having a call from his people in Scotland, to whom he finds himself obliged to return, he desires a certificate of his carriage since he came to Ireland, and hopes he will be excused though he do not come for it, and bid us farewell, withal hoping the meeting will supply Glenarm with ordinances when he is gone. The meeting agrees to Mr. Crawford's desire as to his certificate, and withal appoints Mr. W. Adair to write a line in name of the meeting by Mr. John Campbell, to the gentlemen and Session of Glenarm, resenting their great deficiency to Mr. Anderson and Mr. Campbell, and that they be active in helping this, for the meeting will have a particular care of it."

A subsequent minute informs us that the Clerk sent Mr. Crawford his certificate according to his desire, and also that the meeting appointed Mr. John Campbell "to deal with the people of Glenarm as effectually as he can about the arrears they owe to Mr. Anderson and Mr. Crawford before they go to Scotland;" but I have no idea that in either case the good-natured and brotherly offices of the minister of Cairncastle were productive of any considerable result.

Wyly, and John Young, are also named, about this time, as being Commissioners on different occasions from Glenarm. Of these, Robert Montgomery was the ancestor of the late Mr. Hugh Montgomery, banker, of Belfast, and of the present Mr. John Montgomery, of Benvarden, who still holds a small property near Glenarm. John Wyly was the owner of a tenement in Glenarm, near the Bridge, which is now in the hands of a family called M'Mullan. The other names are well known.

The names of the Elders from Glenarm who are mentioned as attending the meetings during Mr. Crawford's ministry there, are John Miller, William Carnegy, and Jo. Hunter.

(*To be continued.*)

TRUST IS BEST.

I THINK if thou could'st know,
O soul that will complain,
What lies concealed below
Our burden and our pain;
How just our anguish brings
Nearer those longed-for things
We seek for now in vain,—
I think thou would'st rejoice, and not complain.

I think if thou could'st see,
With thy dim mortal sight,
How meanings, dark to thee,
Are shadows hiding light;
Truth's efforts crossed and vexed,
Life's purpose all perplexed,—
If thou could'st see them right,
I think that they would seem all clear, and wise, and bright.

And yet thou can'st not know,
And yet thou can'st not see;
Wisdom and sight are slow
In poor humanity.
If thou would'st *trust*, poor soul,
In Him who rules the whole,
Thou would'st find peace and rest:
Wisdom and sight are well, but Trust is best.

A. A. PROCTOR.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

RECENT BIBLICAL CRITICISM CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH SUGGESTIONS BY WHICH IT MAY REASONABLY BE MODIFIED.

THE following suggestions are addressed to those persons only who are satisfied that the historical criticism of the Bible should be conducted on the same principles, and in the same manner, as that of any other ancient book. To those who think that the Bible was originally written under special divine supervision, and has been since preserved immutably, and exactly in its original state, by the same supervision, these suggestions can be of no avail whatever, inasmuch as they proceed on the opposite assumption already stated, which assumption is clearly and fully vindicated by the indisputable fact of the existence of "various readings" in every book of the Bible, as in every other ancient book, of which numerous manuscripts and versions are available for its critical investigation.

For the purpose of clearly and unmistakably setting forth these suggestions, I shall dwell for a few moments, at the commencement of my remarks, on a very important and fundamental consideration, which is strikingly exhibited and illustrated in the well-known forgery of Thomas Chatterton, in the middle of the last century, when he professed to have received from his father, the sexton of Redcliff Church, in Bristol, several ancient manuscripts found in that church, from the pen of Rowley, a priest of Bristol, in the fifteenth century. Horace Walpole and other scholars, his contemporaries, having investigated the poems published by Chatterton as poems found in these original manuscripts of Rowley, proved, to the satisfaction of almost the entire literary world of their age, that such could not possibly be the fact; inasmuch as these poems contained a few references to inventions and usages which it was well known had no existence whatever until a much later age. Now, it is evident, on a moment's consideration, that the conclusiveness of this argument depends entirely upon the assumption that these manuscripts were the original manuscripts from the pen of Rowley himself. Had they been copies, by a later

hand, and not originals, it is at least *possible* that the copyist might have slightly altered or added to the originals, and that these references to inventions and usages of a later age might have proceeded from *his* pen and not from the pen of the author Rowley himself. I am not aware that any such suggestion was ever advanced by Chatterton himself in defence of the forgery he so admirably executed, and, in the absence of it, there can be little moral doubt that he did forge and not find these manuscripts.

Hence it is important to establish in our minds, at the very outset of our consideration of the historical criticism of the Bible, the conviction and remembrance of the fact, that in every part of it we are dealing, *not* with the *original* manuscripts of the assumed authors of its several books, but with what profess to be only copies and versions of these manuscripts. Until A.D. 1430, when the Art of Printing was invented, every book was copied by hand, and hence was strictly a manuscript.

By the introduction of the Art of Printing we have obtained an additional assurance of correctness of publication, which could not possibly exist when copying by hand was the only method known or employed. It may be reasonably assumed, that in almost every publication of importance, the author himself inspects the proof-sheets of his work, after they have already been subject to the inspection of his printer. Does even this additional assurance, however, make the correctness absolute? Certainly not. Mistakes are still not unfrequently made, and require to be distinctly notified and corrected in a subsequent publication. Absolute and perfect correctness is not therefore to be always expected, even in a publication through the printing press. How much less reasonably, then, could it be expected in connection with the ancient manuscripts and versions of the several books of the Bible!

For the sake of conciseness, I shall confine the remarks that follow to the consideration of that single inquiry to which the critical investigations of the nobly conscientious and liberal-minded Bishop Colenso have recently drawn so much public attention. Was Moses the author of the Pentateuch? Was it actually written originally either

with his own hand or under his immediate and personal direction and supervision?—in either of which cases he might with equal propriety be regarded as its author. If it be absolutely indispensable that, for the profitable consideration of this question, we should have placed before us the identical work which proceeded from the hand or the supervision of Moses himself, we cannot enter upon it all, since no such work is known to exist. A similar requirement would be equally unavailing in regard to almost every other ancient work. We have not in any the manuscript of the original author, but only copies or versions of that manuscript.

To speak only of *copies*, let us briefly pass under our notice a few very obvious considerations which tend to show that alterations and additions must almost necessarily have been made by successive copyists, without, however, thereby destroying the authenticity of the original manuscript which is substantialy embodied in every such copy.

Numerous existing manuscripts clearly show that in ancient times the divisions into words and sentences, which are now so distinctly marked, did not exist at all. The letters in which these ancient manuscripts are written are all of exactly the same height, and are all placed at equal distances from each other, so that the division of them into words and sentences depends entirely upon the knowledge and discrimination of the reader or copyist. Here we have, at the very outset, a fertile source of error. Add to this consideration that in addition to those deviations from the original which even a careful copyist might thus *unintentionally* make, it is at least conceivable that he might make some *intentional* deviations, either for the purpose of rendering more easily intelligible words or expressions, the meaning of which had now become obscure by reason of their antiquity, or for the purpose of giving greater distinctness than the original itself afforded to what he deemed opinions or principles which he nevertheless supposed that it was really intended to express. Moreover, if he had access to more than one manuscript, he might determine the text of his copy as Griesbach determined his text of the New Testament; and this consideration may explain the alleged frequent

accordance of the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Septuagint translation which was made about B.C. 250.

These three considerations alone necessitate our assumption of changes and modifications of the original work having taken place under the hands of successive copyists, by which, however, it is quite clear that the substantial authenticity of the work is not seriously impaired. Add to this the additional consideration that every possessor of a copy of the Pentateuch would feel himself at liberty to insert in his manuscript his own individual comments or annotations precisely as we in these days frequently make ours in the margin of books which we are reading. In our case these marginal notes never can be confounded with the text, inasmuch as they are *written* while the text is *printed;* but when *the whole* was in writing, this clear and marked distinction did not exist at all, and hence the copyist of a manuscript, in which such comments or annotations had been made, might easily assume that they formed part of the original text, and might incorporate them with that text in his own copy accordingly.

How readily and clearly do these rational considerations explain the existence in the Pentateuch, as it is now in our hands, of words and sentences, and even sections, which could *not* have appeared in it at all as it issued from the hands of Moses. Does, then, the existence of these words and sentences and sections in the Pentateuch, as it is now in our hands, conclusively demonstrate that the Pentateuch itself was not substantially the work of Moses? In my judgment it does *not*, inasmuch as their appearance therein must in all reason have been anticipated, except on the supposition, for which we have no warrant whatever, and which ought not to be entertained without absolute and decisive warrant, that the successive translations of the Pentateuch were made under a special divine supervision, which absolutely precluded the possibility of error or change.

In considering, therefore, whether Moses were the author of the Pentateuch, the real question which we have before us is not whether he wrote or authorised every word and sentence and section precisely as we now have it in that volume, but whether the volume, as we

now have it, *substantially* proceeded from him. That it actually *did* proceed from Moses, so far as its essence and substance are regarded, may be conclusively shown, I think, by testimonies both external and internal. One of these testimonies, which alone I shall now adduce, appears to me *decisive*.

I am not aware that the authenticity of the majority of the Psalms ascribed to David has ever been called in question or can reasonably be doubted or denied. Assuming that they are authentic, let us compare their religious character with that of the writings of Homer, who was nearly his contemporary. How striking is the contrast! In David's Psalms we have throughout the reverential recognition and worship of one only God, almighty, all wise, and all gracious. In the Iliad of Homer we have the recognition of many gods, each with his own limited dominion and distinctive individual characteristics, whereby he is often presented in hostility to other gods, as well as to the people who are severally their worshippers. Nothing can be more marked or striking than this contrast, in which the progress of science and of revelation has, in our own days, abundantly proved that the truth and reality are absolutely and entirely with the Jews. David their king stands forth as the sovereign and representative of the Jewish nation at a time when they were the only nation upon earth who had the true knowledge of God, and who devoutly recognised his power and providence. How came this single nation and their monarch to be thus entirely separated from and exalted above all the other nations of the earth, even those who held the foremost ranks in secular and intellectual culture? Four or five centuries at least must have been required to bring about and establish this entire sacred insulation. Assume the four centuries, and you are carried back from the time of David, who flourished 1055 years before Christ, to the time of Moses, who brought the Israelites out of Egypt, B.C. 1491, and who died after having established the revelation and the law which he had received, B.C. 1451. To this revelation and law there are frequent references in the Psalms of David: they must, therefore, have existed in the time of Moses, and were doubtless promul-

gated as recorded in the Pentateuch by him. Hence, notwithstanding the apparent incongruities which a minute verbal criticism brings to light, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Pentateuch, as we now have it, originated with Moses, and was subsequently written by him.

SAMUEL BACHE,
Church of the Messiah, Birmingham.

THE CHARGE OF "SHAMELESS FORGERY."

IN the course of the controversy in *The Christian Unitarian*, between Mr. Martineau and Mr. Scott Porter, the latter, in referring to a sermon of mine, has twice charged me with a very serious offence. In the number for November last (p. 340), he represents a certain quotation in my sermon as "equivalent to a forgery;" and in the number for this month (p. 57), speaking of the same quotation, he says it is "neither more nor less than a shameless forgery."

Conscious that I was not guilty of the offence imputed to me, I took no notice of the charge when it first appeared, believing that it would be generally regarded as one of those hasty utterances—unhappily by no means rare in our recent Irish denominational controversies—in which heated feeling is not over-careful in the choice of its language. But now that, after an interval of several months, Mr. Scott Porter returns to the subject, and, in terms which I shall not characterise, repeats the imputation, I cannot longer remain silent.

I do not intend, however, to give any expression to the strong feeling of indignation with which I regard Mr. Scott Porter's grave but unsupported charge; neither shall I avail myself of the tempting opportunity to retaliate. I shall content myself with submitting a mere exhibit of the facts to which the charge of my accuser relates, feeling perfectly confident that the verdict of the intelligent and candid reader will be everything I could desire.

In 1857, when the Remonstrant Synod had under consideration, with a view to its adoption, a new Code of Discipline—to certain provisions of which, in relation

particularly to "License" and "Ordination," I was very strongly opposed, believing that they involved the utter abandonment of the principle of Non-Subscription—I preached a sermon on the subject, which, at the request of my congregation, I published. In this sermon I dwelt upon the great evils of the creed-system. I shewed, as I believed, that to adopt the testing clauses of the new Code would be to accept the creed-system, with its worst evils; and I then urged the special reasons which I thought should prevent the Remonstrant Synod from ever entertaining the idea of falling back into the ranks of creed-bound churches.

Among these special reasons I cited, and naturally laid much stress on, the argument derived from the Remonstrant movement itself,—a movement which, in its action in the old General Synod, and afterwards, in forming a new organisation, was a standing protest against human authority in matters of religious opinion. Considering it important to leave no room for doubt on this point, I adduced evidence to shew that the Remonstrants separated from the old Synod, not on the ground of difference in theological belief, but solely in assertion and for the maintenance of their religious liberty. This evidence included a quotation from a speech delivered by the Rev. William Porter on taking the chair as first Moderator of the Remonstrant Synod.

My quotation from this speech is what Mr. Scott Porter designates a "shameless forgery."

In order to afford the reader every assistance in forming his own opinion as to the justice of this grave charge, I shall now present side by side, in parallel columns, the report, in full, of Mr. William Porter's speech, as given in *The Bible Christian* from which I quoted, and the extract from the speech, as given in my sermon.

Mr. William Porter's Speech, as given in THE BIBLE CHRISTIAN *for* 1830 (pp. 245—7).

"The Rev. WILLIAM PORTER, on taking the chair, said—Most of us, my Christian brethren and friends, have long been in the habit of witnessing the convention of Synods and Presbyteries. Such assemblies are things of frequent occurrence, and are seldom calculated to excite great intenseness of interest. The present meeting, however, is one of no ordinary character. It is marked by circumstances of a peculiar nature, and which can hardly fail to make the breast heave with emotions not easily suppressed. Cold must

be the blood that is not warmed, dull and phlegmatic must be the spirit which is not animated, by contemplating the situation in which we stand, and the object which we have in view. We have come together on a most interesting occasion. We have come together to lay the foundation-stone of a temple dedicated to RELIGIOUS LIBERTY—a temple under whose ample dome every individual who chooses to enter will be allowed to worship, in his own way, the one God and Father of all. We have come together not merely to propose, but to prove, that we are genuine Presbyterians—assertors of the right of private judgment—and advocates, uncompromising advocates, of the all-sufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith and duty. After years of patient endurance, we have succeeded in throwing off a yoke which was by no means easy—a burden which was far from being light. We have emancipated ourselves and our congregations from a state of spiritual thraldom, and established our claim to those invaluable immunities wherewith Christ intended to make mankind free. *The privilege of Free and Fearless Inquiry* is the groundwork of the church we are now preparing to build, and '*Prove all things*' will be the motto inscribed on its front, in characters of gold. 'Call no man master' we regard as the *Magna Charta* of our ecclesiastical constitution,—Christ, and Christ only, is our king,—the Bible, and the Bible only, is our accredited standard of belief. We do not associate as Calvinists, or Arminians—we do not associate as Unitarians, or Trinitarians—we are Presbyterians. To be enrolled as the first Moderator, chosen by a synod formed on principles so truly evangelical as these, is a distinction highly gratifying, and which is duly appreciated by the individual on whom it has been conferred. Allow him, at the same time, to add, that he does not misconstrue the compliment; he knows well the feeling and motives by which it has been prompted; he knows that it is to be attributed, not to any meritorious services in his power to plead, but purely and exclusively to that fraternal partiality, on the part of the donors, which has followed him all his life long—a consideration which increases his gratitude whilst it represses his self-estimation."

Extract from Mr. William Porter's Speech, as given in my DISCOURSE (p. 16).

"We have come together to lay the foundation-stone of a temple dedicated to RELIGIOUS LIBERTY—*a temple under whose ample dome every individual who chooses to enter will be allowed to worship, in his own way*, the one God and Father of all. . . . After years of patient endurance, we have succeeded in throwing off a yoke, which was by no means easy—a burthen which was far from being light. We have emancipated ourselves and our congregations from a state of spiritual thraldom, and established our claims to those invaluable immunities wherewith Christ intended to make mankind free. The privilege of FREE AND FEARLESS INQUIRY *is the groundwork of the Church we are now preparing to build.* 'PROVE ALL THINGS' *will be the motto inscribed on its front, in characters of gold.*"*

* *Bible Christian*, vol. i., p. 246.

It is obvious that I selected for quotation the part of the speech, and that part only, that bore upon the one point I was then illustrating. It is also obvious that I adopted the usual method of calling attention to those portions of the quotation on which I laid stress, by underlining them. And it is further obvious, that once in the course of the quotation, where I left out a short passage, I indicated the fact in the usual way, by inserting *asterisks*.

Any one can now see that my quotation is word for word with the original, from which I quoted; and that being so, I have only to ask the candid reader—Who is the guilty party? I of "shameless forgery," or my accuser of shameless misrepresentation?

D. MAGINNIS.

STOURBRIDGE, *March* 15, 1866.

[We have inserted the foregoing letter at full length, because we desire that every one whose character has been assailed in the pages of this magazine should have an opportunity of defending himself. In the year 1857, the Remonstrant Synod was engaged in revising its Code of Discipline, and had under consideration a proposal that candidates for License and Ordination should be required to declare "their belief in the sacred Scriptures as containing a divine revelation," and in "the divine mission and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ." Against this proposal Mr. Maginnis, with others, contended strenuously, and he preached and published a sermon which he described as an attempt "to support the principles of Religious Liberty which the Remonstrants of 1829 maintained, and to preserve from apostasy the Church they founded." He endeavoured to show that the founders of the Remonstrant Synod agreed with him in rejecting the test above referred to, as a necessary qualification for Probationers and Ministers; and among the arguments by which he endeavoured to establish this position, he appealed to the statement made by the first Moderator of the body—the Rev. William Porter—who is long deceased, but whose memory is still venerated in our churches: and it is to be noted, that in quoting the words of that illustrious man, Mr. Maginnis passed over what we consider the most remarkable words in the whole speech—"*Christ and Christ only is our King; the Bible and the Bible only is our accredited standard of belief.*" "We have come together not merely to profess but to prove that we are genuine Presbyterians, assertors of the right of private judgment, and *advo-*

cates—uncompromising advocates—of the all-sufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith and duty." These words, in our mind, prove not only that Mr. Porter himself held and deeply cherished the sentiments embodied in the questions of the new Code, but that he regarded them as among the fundamental principles of the Synod which he inaugurated, and of whose views he was the authorized expounder. No one can feel surprised that the Rev. J. Scott Porter, his eldest son, and the representative of his principles as well as his name, should have resented, in emphatic terms, the suppression of these remarkable and important words as a grievous injury to his father's memory.—ED. CH. UN.]

REMONSTRANT PRINCIPLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHIRSTIAN UNITARIAN.

SIR,—I was somewhat surprised to see, in the last issue of *The Christian Unitarian*, that objection had been made to the statement advanced by you in the preceding number, to the effect that "those who lately differed from Dr. Montgomery interpreted the constitution of the Remonstrant Synod as being more comprehensive in its principles than its founders ever designed it to be." Does any man mean to say that the principles originally held and avowed by the Remonstrant Synod are the same, or anything like the same, as those propounded by the body at present bearing that name? Certainly any person who remembers the separation from the Synod of Ulster, and who took ordinary interest in the proceedings connected with that event, may recollect how different was the tone of the Remonstrants then from what it has been of late. I well remember when the ministers returned with the news of the separation, how some people felt, and feared, and how their fears were allayed by assurance that respect for the sufficiency of Scripture was the only motive which led to the secession from the General Synod. The congregations then believed, and, I think, justly, that the great end aimed at by their respective pastors was liberty in the interpretation of Scripture. "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," was the motto on their standard. Is it so now? The Rev. F. Blakely, who was acknowledged to be one of the ablest and most independent champions of Unitarianism, depended on the Bible alone as the weapon with which he could fearlessly meet his opponents. The periodical which they started, and for a long time continued to publish, was called *The Bible Christian*. I will only add that, had the members of the Remonstrant Synod, at the time of its formation, announced their belief in such principles or professions as are now openly avowed, most of them, very soon after the announcement, would have had few hearers to enlighten.—Yours sincerely, B. C.

February 12, 1866.

LETTER OF MR. ROBERT M'CALMONT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

SIR,—Permit me to thank you for inserting a portion of my last letter. I hope you will do me the justice of inserting this one. If you turn to *The Non-Subscriber*, No. 56, pp. 173–8, you will there find a complete exposure of the calumny first promulgated by the late Dr. Montgomery in his speech at Carrickfergus, when he said he had in his possession the statement made by an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, "that it was our design to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian," &c. &c., and that this Elder voted stoutly for the admission of Carrickfergus Congregation into the Presbytery of Antrim. When the calumny was first promulgated, I did not imagine that it referred to me, as I had no voice in the admission of Carrickfergus Congregation, and consequently could not "stoutly vote" on the occasion. But when you were pressed to name the Elder referred to, after a good deal of hesitancy and delay, you named me. In my reply I showed that you had evident design in thus withholding the name of the Elder until the calumny had done its worst. It was further alleged that I stated that the New School party dodged and deceived the Old. It was only after Mr. Goudie wrote me in these words—"I am quite sure, and so is Mr. M'Intyre, that you made no such assertion as that attributed to you, viz., that the New School party dodged and deceived the Old at Presbytery meetings,—that on this count you allowed judgment to go against you by default." The next point which I brought out was, that you aided, assisted, and abetted the writing of the letters that you quoted against me. That I had grounds for charging you with complicity in the matter is evident from the following:—

"I was informed by Mrs. Scott that Mr. M'Alester was present when Mr. Scott wrote the letter to Dr. Beard, and said, 'Send it off—not a bit too strong.'

"(Signed) "JOHN M'INTYRE.

"GIRVAN, 20*th January*, 1864."

In reference to your simple denial of my charge, by saying that it is "a pure fiction, and a foolish one too," I shall only observe, in your own words, "Merely to deny it is indirectly to impute falsehood to those who have declared that he made the statement."

I was charged with having said that it was our design to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian; that the difference between Atheism and Deism is merely nominal; that no minister should be asked to resign, no matter what he preached; that I was no Unitarian, and that I held licentious principles, &c. &c. To substantiate these charges, you hurried over to Girvan with a written statement, and asked the three gentlemen who were present when I was alleged to have made these statements in the Girvan School-room, to sign it, viz., Messrs. Goudie, Coulter, and M'Intyre. Mr. Goudie absolutely refused, and wrote me a letter, in which he says, "I am satisfied that Mr. Scott must have mis-

understood you, and wrote under a wrong impression." From Mr. Coulter, I received the following :—

"GIRVAN, 14*th December*, 1863.

"DEAR SIR,—Having read your explanation of the charges brought against you by the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, I am perfectly satisfied that your opinions have been misrepresented, and that I, along with Mr. Scott, was mistaken in attributing to you statements which you do not believe in. When Mr. M'Alester was here, and asked me to sign his written document, I did so under the impression that it was merely to verify that Mr. Scott would not write anything except he believed it. I signed it, along with Mr. M'Intyre, with the distinct understanding that it was not to be made use of publicly, except Mr. Scott's veracity was impugned. That has not been done, and I think there has been a breach of confidence. I now think that you said the difference between Theism and Deism was merely nominal. I also believe that you were talking of a Catholic or Universal Church, not of a particular congregation, that you would like to see embracing all creeds. When you and my brother-in-law were talking over Unitarian Christianity, you were nearly at one in doctrine, but differed in ecclesiastical discipline.

"(Signed) "JOHN COULTER."

The following is from Mr. M'Intyre :—

"GIRVAN, 20*th January*, 1864.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have heard your explanation of the arguments you brought forward in our School-room here, and I am bound to believe we were mistaken in thinking you held the views as set forth by Mr. Scott. I believe every man has a right to explain what his meaning is, and I am thoroughly convinced that Mr. Scott was under the impression you were talking of the non-testing of ministers by any one, when your meaning was the non-testing of ministers after they were chosen by the congregation.

"(Signed) "JOHN M'INTYRE.

"Mr. M'Calmont."

I also might point out that I refrained from entering again on this controversy, thinking that time would heal up any little differences, and that the calumnies would die out, as may be seen from the date of the above letters; but as recent occurrences have revived the controversy, it becomes incumbent on me to re-open the question. I might also quote the published opinion of an Edinburgh divine :—"I think it positively immoral to charge upon an opponent supposed logical consequences he does not hold, and to interpret his expressions without regard to the limitations he himself has set upon them." But enough, and more than enough, of evidence I have placed before you; and whether you will publish this letter, withdrawing your charges—not by saying I have changed my opinion—or only publish a part, be assured the public are now beginning to learn what value to put on your explanations; and that, as was remarked only a few weeks ago in a public meeting, you have endeavoured to raise up strife between brother and brother. That you may soon acquire and manifest a more Christian spirit, is the wish of, yours, &c.,

ROBERT M'CALMONT.

BELFAST, 19*th February*, 1866.

[Although the subject of which the foregoing letter treats has already occupied too much space in *The Christian Unitarian*, and we are most unwilling to bring it again before our readers, yet, as Mr. M'Calmont's extravagant statements have been referred to in recent articles, and he thinks he can produce evidence to help him out of the awkward position in which his rashness—or worse than rashness—has placed him, we think it only fair towards him to publish what he has to say in his own defence. He does not, however, in any degree improve his case, although he makes an ingenious effort to do so.

We first heard, from the late Rev. Dr. Montgomery, in his speech at Carrickfergus, in December, 1862, the wild views which Mr. M'Calmont had avowed in a friendly discussion with the late Mr. Matthew Scott at Girvan; and we dwelt on them in this magazine as a remarkable illustration of the extreme lengths to which the "absolute liberty" principle led. It was time enough to name the Elder referred to when requested to do so by any authorized party. Most prudently, no such demand was made *till after Mr. Scott's death;* but, as soon as we were so asked, we think Mr. M'Calmont himself will admit—and the pages of this magazine (Vol. ii., pp. 317—321, and pp. 378—386) will abundantly prove—that we gave an answer explicit and distinct enough to satisfy all inquirers.

Mr. Scott reported the opinions advocated by Mr. M'Calmont in two letters, one to the Rev. J. Crozier, dated December 3, 1862, the other to the Rev. Dr. Beard, dated December 22, 1862. In his letter to Mr. Crozier, Mr. Scott thus writes :—

"Mr. M'Calmont said it was their desire to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense—which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, Mahommedans. I said, 'Why exclude Atheists?' He replied that Atheists would not be excluded, and that even if a minister became an Atheist, he thought he should not be required to resign."

In his letter to Dr. Beard, Mr Scott says,—

". . . And let me tell you, if you are not already aware of the fact, that a pet Congregation of the New School has taken the initiative in this direction, bent on building up a church which shall not be exclusively Christian in any sense—which shall welcome alike Deists, Pantheists, Atheists, men of all beliefs and of no belief,—and whose minister shall be at liberty to preach Atheism from the pulpit if he choose, 'because,' say they, 'the difference between Theism and Atheism is merely nominal, and to make belief in a personal God the basis of union would be virtually and actually to own a creed!' . . . . All I have said, and much more to the same effect, was stated to me in presence of several members of our Society, in our vestry, in February last. The church referred to is York Street, Belfast, and my informant is Mr. M'Calmont, who was commissioner for said church when it was admitted into the Antrim Presbytery."

The letters from which we have made these extracts will be found published in full in *The Christian Unitarian* for December, 1863; and to those who knew the late Matthew Scott, his statements, deliberately written to Dr. Beard and Mr. Crozier, would be

ample guarantee of their truth, for a more clear-minded, honourable, and Christian man we have never known; but two of the persons who heard the conversation between Mr. Scott and Mr. M'Calmont, while they were unwilling to do anything that might seem unfriendly or be disagreeable to the latter gentleman, testified to the accuracy of Mr. Scott's report of statements made, and opinions expressed by Mr. M'Calmont—with the reasonable condition that their testimony should not be produced unless Mr. Scott's veracity was impugned. Mr. M'Calmont denied the correctness of Mr. Scott's report, and we were therefore justified in publishing their testimony in its support.

The allegation that Mr. M'Alester assisted Mr. Scott to concoct these letters is a most unjust and ungenerous imputation against Mr. Scott, for it implies that he made himself the tool of another to write slanderous accusations against a fellow-man. After this, let not Mr. M'Calmont affect any respect for the character of Mr. Scott. While all others who knew him, no matter how widely they differed from him in opinion, speak of him with respect, and venerate his memory, let Mr. M'Calmont be silent; he certainly can have no respect for him.

Mr. M'Calmont gives a statement, purporting to be from Mr. M'Intyre, to the effect that Mr. Scott's widow informed him that Mr. M'Alester said of the letter to Dr. Beard, "Send it off—not a bit too strong." Mr. M'Intyre is a truthful man; and, if he wrote that statement, there must have been some confusion in his memory of the matter, for Mr. M'Alester knew nothing of the letter to Dr. Beard, and nothing of the letter to Mr. Crozier—nothing, indeed, of the discussion in the Girvan vestry, *till weeks after those letters were written!* In reference to the alleged statement of Mr. M'Intyre, Mrs. Scott thus writes to Mr. M'Alester—

"I do not remember you saying, 'Send it off'—and do not see why you should say so, for, to the best of my knowledge, it was sent the day after it was written—December 22—and you were not in Girvan till January 31st. I remember speaking to Mr. M'Intyre on the subject. I told him that Mr. Scott read a copy of the letter to you, and that you did not think it a bit too strong; but I never said that it was written in your presence, and that you said, 'Send it off'—simply because that would not have been true.

"PAISLEY, *Feb.* 24, 1866." "ELIZABETH SCOTT.

Respecting the letter which Mr. M'Calmont has published from Mr. Coulter, we have to state that there is a semblance of truth in it. Mr. M'Alester showed Mr. Coulter the letter of Mr. Scott to Mr. Crozier; he said the report of Mr. M'Calmont's statement was quite correct. Mr. M'Alester then asked him to state so on paper, and Mr. Coulter requested him to write a sentence to that effect and he would sign it. This he did, and the same certificate was signed by Mr. M'Intyre. Here it is—

"We have seen the letter of Mr. Matthew Scott to the Rev. J. A. Crozier, dated December 3, 1862, in which a report is given of statements made and opinions expressed by Mr. Robert M'Calmont, in the School-room of the Girvan Unitarian Church. We were present on

the occasion referred to, and we hereby certify that the report given by Mr. Scott is correct.

"(Signed) "JOHN COULTER.
"JOHN M'INTYRE.

"GIRVAN, *May* 13, 1863."

Mr. Goudie was not asked to sign this document; for, when spoken to on the subject of Mr. M'Calmont's discussion with Mr. Scott, he expressed unwillingness to say anything about it; and we do not wonder that his friendship for Mr. M'Calmont should lead him to avoid the subject. It should be remarked, that Mr. M'Calmont's views, as reported by Mr. Scott, are not "supposed logical consequences," nor "expressions interpreted without regard to the limitations he himself set upon them," but opinions *distinctly avowed, without limitation or restriction*—opinions which far outstrip those of most of the "advanced thinkers," and of which his party —and we hope now himself too—are thoroughly ashamed. His apologists allege that he sometimes, for the sake of argument, or to startle "weaker" minds, says more than he thinks. Perhaps it is so; and we shall take his effort to escape from his own statements as a sign of improvement, which, we sincerely hope, may continue. To have such views identified with the membership—not to speak of the eldership—of any congregation that claims even the name of Christian, is discreditable in the extreme.

The remark that we endeavoured "to raise up strife between brother and brother" was a mere rhetorical flourish, and was entirely untrue, as rhetorical flourishes often are. We are advocates of peace, and we have often urged that no diversity of theological opinion, however wide, should produce unkindness or alienation; but we do not belong to the peace-at-any-price party, and we should be ashamed of ourselves, and of the cause which we advocate, if we were willing to compromise principle for sake of peace, or sacrifice truth to friendship.—ED. CH. UN.]

INTELLIGENCE.

ADELAIDE UNITARIAN CONGREGATION, SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

IT will be satisfactory to the friends who so kindly responded to the application for contributions in aid of the Adelaide Congregational Library, to find, by the following letter from the respected minister of the congregation, that their donations have arrived safely, and have proved, as was to have been expected, gratifying to the persons for whose use they were presented. It would be well if at every port to which emigrants from the Old Country direct their course, a minister and congregation were to be found equally zealous, intelligent, and judicious with Mr. Woods and his flock:—

"ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, *Jan.* 22*nd*, 1866.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I must explain why I have not written to you sooner, to thank you and my kind friends in the North of Ireland for

the books and tracts sent for our church library here. When I got your letter informing me that the books were coming, I thought I should be able to tell you of their arrival, if I delayed writing for a mail; but from one cause and another they have only now come to hand. They were detained in Birmingham, and the ship in which they were sent got aground in Australia. However, I have now got them safe, and, on my own behalf and that of my friends, I thank you all very sincerely. My friend, Mrs. Leech, of Goose Hall, Cheshire, has sent me £10 worth of books, and I have got £10 worth from my friends in London, besides some smaller contributions. So you see I can well redeem, owing to your and other people's kindness, the pledge I made, that if the people would build, I would start the furnishing of a library. I was concerned to hear by your last letter that my old instructor and friend, Dr. Montgomery, was so ill. I hope he is now better. . . . . We are suffering here from a drought. I travelled last week 120 miles to lecture at two Mechanics' Institutes, when the thermometer was 157° in the sun and 109° in the shade. We get well paid for our services here; but if our constitutions do not suffer, our *complexions* certainly do. With kind regards, and again thanking you and our friends for their kind contributions, I am, ever truly yours,

"Rev. J. S. Porter." "J. Crawford Woods.

SETTLEMENT OF A UNITARIAN MISSIONARY AT DUNDEE.

On Sunday, February 18, the Rev. H. Williamson, of the Home Missionary Board, Manchester, was settled as Unitarian Missionary at Dundee. For two years past the Rev. W. Sharman, of Aberdeen, had made occasional visits to Dundee, where, for twenty years before, there had been no Unitarian preaching, and the success of Mr. Sharman had been such as to justify the Scottish Unitarian Association in placing a missionary there. In the morning, the devotional services were conducted by the Rev. J. Wright, of Bury, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. R. Drummond, of Edinburgh, from Matt. ix. 17. In the afternoon, Mr. Drummond conducted the devotional service, and the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, of Glasgow, delivered the charge to the missionary. He said that he would ask him no questions as to his belief, nor seek to impose on him any authoritative creed. He was satisfied that he was an earnest truth-loving man, and he exhorted him to be over true and faithful to the light within him. D. Jobson, Jun., Esq., in a brief address, welcomed Mr. Williamson on behalf of the Congregation. Mr. Williamson's reply was brief and earnest. Mr. Wright then gave a charge to the Congregation, pointing out the obligations which devolved on them. There was a third service in the evening, at which Mr. Wright preached, taking for his subject "Unitarian Christianity." A soiree was held on the following evening, at which about seventy persons were present. H. C. Briggs, Esq., of Dundee, presided, and the proceedings were characterised by great earnestness and good feeling.

THE SOUTHERN UNITARIAN FUND SOCIETY AND THE LATE REV. DR. MONTGOMERY.

At the Quarterly Meeting of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society, held at the High Street Chapel, Portsmouth, on March 7, 1866—

the Rev. Henry Hawkes, B.A., F.L.A., in the chair—it was unanimously resolved, on the motion of the Rev. Edmund Kell, M.A., F.S.A., seconded by the Rev. E. R. Grant, minister of St. Thomas Street Chapel, Portsmouth,—

"That, bearing in mind the late Dr. Montgomery's long and invaluable services to the Unitarian Christians of Ireland, this Committee desire to record their deep regret at the loss their fellow-Christians in the sister kingdom, and the Unitarian Church generally, have sustained in the death of so eminent a champion of their cause; and to express their warm admiration of his commanding eloquence, and their high respect for his manly integrity, and for his untiring efforts to promote Civil and Religious Liberty and the life-giving interests of Christian Truth and Righteousness."

The Committee beg, also, respectfully to tender their sincere and heartfelt condolence to his sorrowing widow and family under their heavy bereavement.

The following is the letter of the Secretary of the Southern Society in transmitting the Resolution:—

"Portswood Lawn, Southampton, *March* 8, 1866.

"Dear Madam,—In transmitting to you, as Secretary, the accompanying resolutions of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society, permit me to express my grateful recollections of the personal courtesy of your revered husband whenever I have had occasion to correspond with him through life, and the high estimation in which I held a share in his friendship. At the time of his removal, I could not but advert to his character from the pulpit, with sentiments of deep respect. With my fervent prayer that our Heavenly Father will heal the wound He has inflicted, and impart to the mourning relatives His richest consolations, believe me, dear Madam, yours very faithfully,

"Edmund Kell.

"Mrs. Montgomery."

GOVERNMENT GRANT TO THE WIDOW OF DR. MONTGOMERY.

We are much gratified in being enabled to state that Lord Russell has conveyed, in very kind and feeling terms, to the widow of the late Dr. Montgomery, the intention of the Government to appropriate, from the Annual Pension Fund, the sum of £100 per annum for the use of her and her daughter during their joint lives. This grant has been made in acknowledgment of Dr. Montgomery's public services as a distinguished advocate of Civil and Religious Liberty.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WIDOWS' FUND ASSOCIATION.

At the Annual Meeting of the Presbyterian Widows' Fund Association, held in Belfast, March 14th, the following Resolution, referring to a Resolution on the same subject, proposed by the Rev. Dr. Cooke, and passed at a late meeting of the Directors, was unanimously carried—"That this meeting expresses its entire appro-

val of the action of the Directors in the high estimate they had formed, and recorded in their Minutes, of the valuable services rendered to this Association by the late Dr. Montgomery, their sense of the loss it has sustained by his death, and in conveying to his bereaved widow and family the expression of their deep sympathy with them under their afflictive bereavement."

ORDINATION AT DUNMURRY.

On Tuesday, March 20, the Remonstrant Presbytery of Bangor met at Dunmurry for the purpose of ordaining the Rev. T. H. M. Scott, M.A., recently of Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, to the pastoral charge of the congregation, vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery. Owing to the extreme severity of the day, the attendance was smaller than otherwise it would have been. There were present the Revds. John M'Caw, John Orr, and John Porter of the Bangor Presbytery, the Revds. William Crozier and John Crozier of the Armagh Presbytery, and the Rev. C. J. M'Alester of the Northern Presbytery of Antrim. The Rev. John Porter conducted the introductory religious services, and preached from 1 Kings ii. 2—"Be thou strong, therefore, and shew thyself a man." The Rev. John M'Caw explained concisely and clearly his views of Presbyterian ordination, and put to Mr. Scott a question respecting the sufficiency of the holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and duty, and respecting the right of private judgment, to which Mr. Scott gave a satisfactory reply. He then, on the part of the congregation and at their desire, put to him the three following questions:—Do you believe in One God, the Creator and Governor of the Universe? Do you acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to contain a Divine Revelation? Do you believe in the Divine Mission and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world? To each of these questions Mr. Scott answered in the affirmative, and then proceeded to make a fuller statement of his religious opinions, not merely, as he said, in accordance with the prevalent usage on such occasions, but agreeably also to the dictates of his own mind. After enumerating very distinctly the leading points of his Christian faith, he expressed with equal distinctness his disbelief in certain doctrines held by various churches, such as the Trinity, Original Sin, and a Vicarious Atonement. He then dwelt on the Christian miracles, affirming his belief in them, and arguing that the denial of them was, in his mind, a virtual rejection of Christ and his Gospel, and concluded by signifying his belief in the Holy Scriptures as given by the inspiration of God, but his disbelief in their verbal or their plenary inspiration. Such, he added, is my statement of belief. I make it honestly before men; I make it humbly before God. Mr. Scott was then ordained by the laying on of hands to the work of the ministry, the Rev. William Crozier offering up the ordination prayer. The Rev. John Orr closed the proceedings by a lucid charge to the minister and the congregation.

In the afternoon, Mr. Scott and the members present were entertained at dinner by the congregation, John Roberts, Esq.,

J.P., Collin House, in the chair. The attendance of members of the congregation and their friends of various denominations was very large. After the usual loyal toasts had been drunk, and the memory of Dr. Montgomery had been received in solemn silence, the chairman gave "The health of Mr. Scott, their newly-ordained minister." Mr. Scott replied at some length, paying a just tribute of respect to the memory of his distinguished predecessor, signifying his purpose to maintain and advocate the views of Christian doctrine which he had that day avowed, but expressing his sincere desire to hold out the right hand of fellowship to every one who called himself a disciple of Christ. The Rev. J. Orr responded to "The Officiating Ministers," and the Rev. W. Crozier proposed "The Dunmurry Congregation," which was replied to by Mr. James Hunter. "Civil and Religious Liberty all over the World" was spoken to by Mr. Hugh M'Call, a member of the Established Church, who paid a warm tribute to the memory of Dr. Montgomery. After the health of the chairman, and other toasts, had been given, the proceedings terminated. A spirit of unanimity prevailed throughout, but to many of those present the meeting was saddened by the thought that he who, for more than half a century, had been the presiding mind in Dunmurry, was no more, and that another—we believe a worthy and earnest man—had now taken his place.

LECTURE BY THE REV. F. M'CAMMON.

On Tuesday evening, February 13, the Rev. Francis M'Cammon, of Springvale, Doagh, gave a lecture in the Assembly-Room, Crumlin, taking for his subject—"A Tour on the Continent,"—A. Larmour, Esq., Edendale, Glenavy, in the chair. The attendance was large and respectable, and all listened to the lecture throughout with attention and delight. The rev. gentleman described his tour through Belgium, Holland, Germany, and Switzerland, in a most graphic and happy manner. His description of his visit to the banks of the Rhine, and of his ascent of the Swiss mountains, was particularly interesting. After interesting his audience for two hours, Mr. M'Cammon found it impossible to close his subject in the space of a single lecture, and reserved, for a subsequent occasion, his sketch of France and Austria, which he promised to give, with the understanding that the proceeds should be devoted to provide fuel and clothing for the poor of Crumlin and its neighbourhood. A cordial vote of thanks to the lecturer being proposed by Dr. Hume, and another to the chairman by the Rev. R. Cleland, the meeting separated, highly gratified. The money realised by the sale of tickets was appropriated to the repairs of Gortnagallon School-House.

MONTHLY SUMMARY OF INTELLIGENCE.

The Paisley Unitarian Congregation held their Annual Soiree on Thursday evening, February 22, Mr. C. Mills in the chair. The attendance was larger than on any former occasion. A number of

friends from Glasgow were present. The Rev. H. W. Crosskey, and Messrs. Calender, Wylie, and M'Ilwrath, addressed the meeting; and the proceedings were varied by a number of musical pieces, which were sung with much taste.

On Sunday, February 25th, the Rev. W. H. Channing preached in Unity Church, Islington, in behalf of the Carter Lane Mission, which is carried on with great success by Mr. Taylor, and is doing a good work in a densely-peopled district of London. The collection amounted to £81. On the following evening the Annual Meeting was held at the mission premises, Friar Street, Doctors' Commons. Tea was provided at 6 o'clock, and the chair was taken by James Heywood, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., at 7 o'clock. There was a large assemblage of ladies and gentlemen. The Report, which was a very able and satisfactory one, having been adopted, and resolutions having been passed relating to the government of the Society, a vote of thanks to Mr. Channing for his services on the previous day was carried with acclamation.

On Wednesday, February 20, a meeting of the Teachers' Union, in connexion with the Northern Sunday-School Association, was held at the Mission House, Stanhope Street, Belfast. The object of the meeting was to endeavour to awaken an increased interest in the Sunday-School work. The chair was taken by the Rev. T. Bowring, and, after devotional exercises, conducted by the Rev. J. Jellie, the chairman dwelt at some length on the nature and objects of the Sunday-School. Remarks were also made by Mr. Jellie and Mr. M'Alester. The attendance was considerable, and much interest seemed to be taken in the proceedings.

On Sunday, February 25th, the Rev. J. Drummond, of Manchester, preached two sermons in the old Meeting-house, in behalf of the Unitarian Domestic Mission, Birmingham. The collections amounted to £55. On the following evening the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting was held, Brooke Smith, Esq., in the chair. The Committee's Report having been read and adopted, the missionary, the Rev. B. Wright, read a very interesting report of his labours. A cordial vote of sympathy with Mr. Wright, in his labours, having been passed, and thanks having been voted to Mr. Drummond for his services on the preceding day, the meeting separated.

On February 14th, the congregation of the Brook Street Chapel, Knutsford, Cheshire, presented to their pastor, the Rev. Henry Green, on the occasion of his entering the fortieth year of his ministry, a beautiful timepiece of black marble and bronze, with a study chair, and a purse containing £275, as tokens of their esteem and regard.

On Monday, March 5, the Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Liverpool Domestic Mission was held at the Mission House, Bedford Street, the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, President of the Society, in the chair. The chairman reviewed the operations of the Society in the past year, and gave an interesting sketch of its several departments of Christian work. A resolution, expressive of un-

abated interest in the Mission and of thanks to the missionaries, the Rev. J. Shannon and the Rev. T. Jones, for their faithful services, was introduced by the Rev. J. H. Thom, and was carried unanimously. Mr. Shannon, in responding to the resolution, spoke of improvidence, drunkenness, and poverty, as the most pressing evils which the ministers encountered, and Mr. Jones described drunkenness as the concentration of all wickedness. The Committee's Report, and the Treasurer's Statement of Accounts having been adopted, a committee for the next year was appointed, and the proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

The Rev. W. C. Coupland, B.A., whose sermon, entitled "Shall we not go Forward," was noticed in *The Christian Unitarian* of December last (pp. 361–6), has accepted an invitation to become the minister of Christ Church Chapel, Bridgewater. The congregation intend to invite a colleague with Mr. Coupland.

The fifty-fourth social meeting of the London District Unitarian Society was held on February 23rd. The subject announced for consideration was "The relative position of Unitarianism in England and America," and the Rev. W. H. Channing, late of Washington, U.S., occupied the chair. The Chairman, after reviewing at length the state of religious opinion in the two countries, both in reference to the past and the present, and noticing the indications of progress which were manifesting themselves in various churches, said, that as he looked on the signs of the times here and in the United States and throughout Christendom, the movements everywhere denoted that Providence is preparing for a transformation of the existing communions into some glorious new temple of universal holiness, humanity, and freedom of thought, the name of which none of us are prepared yet to give, but of which we all may be prophets. Everywhere appeared a new and intenser zeal to be worthy of the name of children of God, a new spirit of humanity poured into us that should make our worship our work, and our work our worship, awakening a new sentiment of love that would bring men of all classes more heartily together, and bind all nations of Christendom in a living unity. The Revs. R. Spears, H. Ierson, M. Conway, and R. B. Aspland, Mr. Alderman J. C. Lawrence, and others, subsequently addressed the meeting, and, after a vote of thanks to the chairman, the proceedings were closed with prayer.

On March 15th, the spring meeting of the Bolton District Unitarian Association was held at Rochdale. Service was held at half-past two o'clock, when the Rev. T. W. Freckleton preached on "the relation of the preacher to his work and to his people." There was afterwards a tea meeting, which was numerously attended. After tea, the annual business meeting of the "East Lancashire Unitarian Mission" was held. Mr. Joshua Fielden presided, and the Secretary, the Rev. J. Wright, read the report for the past year, which was adopted. Various speakers addressed the meeting, and the proceedings were brought to a close by a hearty vote of thanks to the Bolton Congregation for their hospitable arrangements.

OBITUARY.

Died, on March 11, at the residence of her son-in-law, Rev. Dr. Russell, Franklin Place, Belfast, Sarah, relict of the late Robert Coffey, Esq., M.D., Belfast.

Died, on March 4, at the residence of her son-in-law, Mr. William Killips, Craigavad, Holywood, Mrs. Bain, aged 61 years.

Died, on January 1, at Victoria, Vancouver's Island, Alexander, eldest son of the late Alexander Montgomery, Esq., Solicitor, Belfast, aged 36 years.

Died, on March 8, at 61, Carlisle Street, Belfast, Sarah, relict of the late Mr. James Warnock.

Died, on March 1, at his residence, Antrim, Mr. Matthew Gibson, in the 85th year of his age. Mr. Gibson was for many years a leading member of the old Congregation of Antrim, and was universally respected.

Died, March 10, at Dromain, in the Parish of Cairncastle, near Larne, Catherine, daughter of the late Mr. Samuel Richards, aged 54 years.

Died, on March 22, at Glenview, Ballynadrenta, near Crumlin, Mr. John Christie, Sen., in the 89th year of his age.

Died, on February 25, the Rev. John Edward Jones, of Bridgend, Glamorganshire, in the 65th year of his age, leaving a widow and a large circle of friends to lament his loss. Mr. Jones was, we believe, a native of Caermarthen, and having passed through the usual curriculum in the Presbyterian College there, he undertook the charge of the Unitarian Congregations at Bettws and Bridgend about the year 1822. Among his fellow-ministers, Mr. Jones was distinguished by simplicity of manners and kindness of disposition. His pulpit discourses were characterized by sound, good sense. He was for several years examiner in Hebrew and Mathematics at Caermarthen College. As a neighbour, he made himself useful in many ways, often settling for his friends knotty questions which would otherwise have got into the hands of the lawyers. But he will be longest and most gratefully remembered among the Welsh-speaking population of the Principality as editor of the *Ymofynydd*, the Welsh Unitarian monthly periodical, which was started in September, 1847, and was kept up, with one short interruption, till June, 1865, when it was discontinued, owing to the failing health of the editor. By Mr. Jones's death, two more pulpits are left vacant, with but little prospect of being filled for some years at least. We are glad to learn that the Rev. D. L. Evans, of Caermarthen, has promised to undertake the editorship of the *Ymofynydd*, and that it may be expected to appear again shortly.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] MAY, 1866. [No. 4.

A CRISIS IN ENGLISH UNITARIANISM.

MORE than forty years ago an organization was formed by the leading members of the Unitarian denomination in England, for the promotion of their religious views and the maintenance of their civil rights. Its objects, as stated in the fundamental rules, were, "the promotion of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad; the support of its worship; the diffusion of biblical, theological, and literary knowledge on topics connected with it; and the maintenance of the civil rights and interests of its professors." It is to be observed that this organization—denominated "the British and Foreign Unitarian Association"—exhibits no minute statement of religious belief as the creed of its members, but its doctrinal principles were sufficiently designated by the well-understood term "Unitarian Christianity." It was Christianity, and not Deism,—Christianity, as taught by Christ and his apostles, and as embodied in the New Testament Scripture. It was not simply the moral precepts of the Gospel, but also its doctrinal truths, and most prominent among these, the mission of Christ from God. It was lately stated at a meeting of Unitarians, who agreed to abandon the Unitarian name, that "the Christian Church was planted without a single dogma"!* We should like to examine the New Testament of these latitudinarians, and see how much remained after their ingenious and unscrupulous elimination of everything not only miraculous, but also dogmatic. The founders of the Unitarian Association accepted the dogmatic as well as the devotional and moral in Christianity. This will be evident, whether we

* Report of first meeting of Midland Christian Union, in *Inquirer* of April 7.

consider their own religious opinions, or the general character of the publications which they issued. In these publications prominence is given to the authoritative teaching of Christ, and to the truth of Divine Revelation as embodied in the Holy Scriptures. While the Christian element in the Association excluded Deism, and all *isms* akin to Deism and beyond it, its Unitarian name distinguished it from the Christianity of Trinitarian Churches. We have said that it presented no creed of minute articles, but yet it embodied two essential articles of faith, namely, Christianity and Unitarianism. Casuists might argue that these articles do not exclude either Trinitarians on the one hand or Deists on the other; for Trinitarians will tell you that they believe, as truly as their anti-Trinitarian neighbours, in the unity of God, and Deists will tell you, in all seriousness, that they are Christians, for they accept the moral teachings of Christ as true and right. But no man, whatever may be his religious opinions, could honestly argue thus: the origin of the Association and its history through so many years, the opinions of its earliest members, and the volumes and tracts which have been issued by it, would all disprove such a position.

Till recently, the principles of the Association were acknowledged, and its objects were approved by English Unitarians generally; and, in addition to annual subscriptions, it received occasional bequests and donations, which have considerably enlarged its means of "promoting the principles of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad." Latterly, however, new and strange views have been adopted by some Unitarian ministers and many Unitarian laymen, and we are constrained to make the painful admission that these views threaten to bear down the distinctively Christian principles of Unitarianism, and reduce it to a form of thought which may be best described as *the largest possible liberty, and the smallest possible belief.* It is true that this wild scepticism is not limited to England; in America it is equally rampant: but it is with its relation to English Unitarianism we have at present to do. For several years, sentiments which clash with Christianity in any form, have been broached at Unitarian meetings, preached from Unitarian pulpits, and

avowed not only by the correspondents, but even by the editors of Unitarian periodicals. To such an extent had these advanced opinions been advocated, that at the last annual meeting of the British and Foreign Association, one of its most able and worthy members—the Rev. Samuel Bache—gave notice that at the next annual meeting—to be held towards the end of the present month—he would move a resolution, calling on the Committee distinctly to define the principles and objects of the Association. The discussions which have since been carried on in the leading Unitarian journals, the accusations which have been hurled against Mr. Bache and his supporters, of seeking to impose a creed, to interfere with conscience, and to destroy the traditional liberties of the denomination, and the almost entire silence of those who are known to sympathize with Mr. Bache's principles, and with the object at which he aims, though possibly they may dissent from the mode which he has taken to carry it out, lead us to believe that his efforts to vindicate Unitarian Christianity from the sceptical principles which have fastened themselves upon it, and are blighting and destroying it, will fail, and a rational and Scriptural faith, which has met the spiritual wants of so many of the worthiest and most enlightened Christians, will, for a time, be eclipsed by a religious system which seems to have but two articles of belief—*the unity of God*, and *the freedom of the human soul*. Should such be the result, the members who value Christianity as a Divine Revelation may still see grounds for hoping that the Association may soon right itself; but if there be no grounds for such an expectation, we doubt not that they will withdraw from a society of whose principles they so entirely disapprove. There can be no association for distinctly religious purposes, as, for example, the dissemination of Christian truth by missionary efforts, between those who accept Jesus as the Christ, and receive the Gospel as embodying God's divine Word, and those who see nothing specially divine either in Jesus or his Gospel.

Should the issue be as unsatisfactory at the approaching meeting of the Association as we apprehend, it may become matter of grave consideration how far moneys

which have been given or bequeathed for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity, can be legitimately applied for the teaching of doctrines so essentially different. Whatever may be fairly done with trusts that are open, and funds that have been given for some vague and indefinite purpose, it would be easy enough to show that much at least of the money received by the Unitarian Association, was given in trust for a specific purpose, and could no more be applied for the dissemination of Parkerism or Couplandism than for that of Calvinism or Swedenborgianism.

But another question, we presume, will be raised, directly or indirectly, at the coming meeting. The Rev. J. Martineau, and others in concert with him, and with him as their leader, contend that it is for the interest of their Church that all sectarian names should be dropped, and that the great aim should be to cultivate and promote the Christian "pieties and charities," without regard to doctrinal distinctions. Mr. Martineau argues that the Christian Church should not have a doctrinal basis, and that the conditions of Church communion ought to be as wide as those of admission into heaven. We think it would be easy to show that such a theory, however beautiful to contemplate, is utterly impracticable. No church on earth could be so constituted; or, if it were, it must speedily fall to pieces. Few, if any, Unitarians hold the Calvinistic doctrine of the damnation of the heathen: they believe therefore, that heathens shall be admitted into heaven. Must this new and catholic Church be so liberal in its principles and so broad in its foundation, that heathens may satisfactorily worship in its courts, and heathens acceptably serve at its altar? And so we might remark of Atheist, Jew, and Deist, all of whom reject him who is the "corner-stone" of the Gospel Church. Must our constitution be such as to meet all their doubts and scruples? But it may be said that it is only meant, in this liberal Church, to include Christians. Well, even with such a limitation the proposal is almost equally absurd. With some, at least, who sigh for such an unsectarian Church, "Christian" has a pretty wide meaning, embracing all, from the most rigid Roman Catholic to the most irreverent unbeliever; for men, according to

their theory of Christianity, may scoff at miracle, and revelation, and Christ, and yet claim the Christian name. How could it be expected that those who devoutly believe that Jesus came from God to unfold his character and his will, and who regard him as the Mediator between God and men, could profitably or patiently sit under the ministrations of one who thinks of him only as a benevolent but enthusiastic and deluded Jew? Or how could persons differing so widely respecting the Saviour join in making that Saviour known to others? What united missionary efforts could be made by persons holding such opposite opinions on the very subject which they desire to teach? And let us take those who, agreeing in accepting the Scriptures as containing a Divine Revelation, differ respecting the nature of Christ, some believing that he is God, and ought to be worshipped as God, and others holding that he is not God, but the Son of God, and that men ought to worship the Father only;—how can they satisfactorily join in habitual worship? If prayer is offered to Christ, the conscience of one is wounded; if prayer be not offered to Christ, the spiritual wants of the other are not satisfied. It may be alleged that the unsectarian and free church which Mr. Martineau and his adherents advocate is only for union, and not for worship; only for the spread of Christian knowledge and holiness, not for congregational purposes. But we reply that such an organization could do little to disseminate either knowledge or holiness, for its members would differ *in toto* as to what Christian knowledge is, and as to the means of promoting Christian righteousness. The Rev. W. H. Channing, writing to an American journal respecting the ground for union which we are examining, and which he represents, we hope incorrectly, as "already assumed by the leading Unitarians in Great Britain, indeed by a vast majority of both ministers and laity," says, "The tendency is irresistible to the broadest *inclusiveness;* and the longest-headed and largest-hearted do not pretend to mark out the limitations on the side of traditional Orthodoxy, or of rational freedom."* We can safely affirm that although this CATHOLIC church, as

* *Monthly Journal of American Unitarian Association*, for April, p. 191.

Mr. Channing not unaptly terms it, may open its doors wide for all, no adherents of "traditional Orthodoxy" will enter: and neither should any who value a distinctly Christian faith enter into a religious organization which drags that faith down to a level with the latest, if not the lowest, form of unbelief. When, in the exercise of free thought, men, equally earnest in seeking the truth, arrive at different conclusions, true liberality, real catholicity, consists in each maintaining his own views, while he respects his brother who differs from him; and it is not liberality but indifferentism which would remove the peculiar tenets of each, and present the miserable remnant as the true catholic faith.

We look forward with much interest, and, we confess, with much apprehension, to the approaching meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. We know that what we may call the "Unbelief" party, and, which in this case amounts to the same thing, those who, on the ground of religious liberty, support it, are numerous and increasing; and we know how the cry of "intolerance" may intimidate many, and a love of peace may influence more, to be silent. We know, also, how powerful are the advocates who have thrown themselves into the "No Belief" scheme, and how attractive, though utterly visionary, is the idea of Churches of differing and opposing views uniting together for the cultivation and spread of the Christian "pieties and charities." It is certainly a crisis in English Unitarianism. We much fear that the Gospel principles which have been elaborated and defended by Milton, Locke, and Newton, by Price and Priestley, by Belsham and Lindsay, Carpenter, Aspland, and Armstrong, and other noble minds, will be swamped by the combined forces of those who would unchristianize Unitarianism, and those who would extinguish it. Still we do not despair: those rational views of Christianity which, so long obscured by the lingering superstitions of a darker age, have been vindicated by many of the best and ablest of our race, may for a time be again overshadowed by human theories and speculations; but in God's providence we believe they must eventually triumph, for they seem to be the only views in which Reason and Revelation meet and harmonize.

THE GREAT WORSHIP.

The harp at Nature's advent strung
Has never ceased to play;
The song the stars of morning sung
Has never died away.

And prayer is made, and praise is given,
By all things near and far;
The ocean looketh up to heaven,
And mirrors every star.

Its waves are kneeling on the strand
As kneels the human knee,
Their white locks bowing to the sand,
The priesthood of the sea!

They pour their glittering treasures forth,
Their gifts of pearl they bring,
And all the listening hills of earth
Take up the song they sing.

The green earth sends her incense up
From many a mountain shrine;
From folded leaf and dewy cup
She pours her sacred wine.

The mists above the morning rills
Rise white as wings of prayer;
The altar-curtains of the hills
Are sunset's purple air.

The winds with hymns of praise are loud,
Or low with sobs of pain;
The thunder-organ of the cloud,
The dropping tears of rain.

With drooping head and branches crossed,
The twilight forest grieves,
Or speaks with tongues of Pentecost
From all its sunlit leaves.

The blue sky is the temple's arch,
Its transept earth and air;
The music of its starry march
The chorus of the prayer.

So nature keeps the reverent frame
With which her years began,
And all her signs and voices shame
The prayerless heart of man.—JOHN G. WHITTIER.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

WE take the present opportunity of directing the attention of our readers to some matters of an unusual nature, and also of considerable importance, which are to be brought forward at the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which will be held in London on the 23rd of May.

The Association was formed in the year 1825, "for the promotion of *Unitarian Christianity* at home and abroad,—the support of its worship,—the diffusion of biblical, theological, and literary knowledge on topics connected with it,—and the maintenance of the civil rights and interests of its professors." Its income last year, from subscriptions and donations, was £619 8s 6d; and from other sources, about £300.

At the approaching meeting Mr. Bache has given notice of his intention to move—

"That whereas, since the last annual meeting of the Association, the terms *Christ*, *Christian*, and *Christianity* have been employed by some Unitarian writers, and in some Unitarian publications, as consistent with the either clearly implied or distinctly avowed repudiation of the special and immediate divine origin and authority of the Christian revelation; and whereas an ambiguity has thereby been occasioned in the terms which at present define the principles and objects of this Unitarian Association, the Committee for the ensuing year be instructed to take measures for the removal of that ambiguity, and so to express the principles and objects of the Association that no reasonable doubt may remain respecting them."

We have given deliberate and anxious consideration to the foregoing notice of motion, and the result on our mind is a desire that Mr. Bache should, for the present at

least, withdraw it. We deplore, as earnestly as he can do, the abuse of language to which it refers. We protest against it now, as on all occasions. We should probably go much farther than he would, in reprobating the dishonesty of those who claim to be considered as Christians while they are doing their utmost to tear up the very foundations of the Christian faith. We fully admit his premises; but we cannot see the connexion between them and the conclusion which he builds upon them. If indeed the Association or its Committee had sanctioned, adopted, or acted upon the erroneous interpretation to which he refers,—if they had affirmed, or even tacitly recognised, that erroneous interpretation to be the true one,—if they had sent out missionaries to preach Deism or Atheism,—or if they had converted their Book and Tract Department into an agency for diffusing infidel sentiments under the name of Christianity, the case would be clear. Mr. Bache would then have a right, and it would be his duty, to endeavour to recall the Association to its original principles, and to try to rectify the wrong. But nothing like this has occurred, or is likely to occur. The grounds on which he relies are the statements of individual writers and publications merely. These we cannot look upon as sufficient to authorise a demand for a definition of terms, which, as we have ever maintained, convey their own meaning to every candid mind. And if a new definition of their meaning be, in Mr. Bache's opinion, required, we do not see the propriety of throwing upon the Committee the task of preparing it. Mr. Bache ought to propose it himself; no man is more capable of doing it correctly. He will not misunderstand the tenour of these remarks. We go heartily with him in the views which he has so clearly stated and so powerfully enforced, on many occasions, respecting the divine character and source of the blessed Gospel. We conceive that he has laid the Church of Christ under a weighty obligation by the stand which he has made in defence of its fundamental principle. Still we do not see, as he does, the propriety, in the present circumstance of the Association, of pressing the resolution of which he has given notice. Something, we admit, may depend on the temper of the meeting. The mention of it may be received in such a way as will ren-

der it imperative on him to persevere: but we hope this will not be the case, and that he will feel justified in withdrawing it.

The other subject of discussion, of which intimation has been given, relates to the constitution of the Association itself. By the rules which have been in force since 1825, the Association consists of *Individual Members*, *District Associations*, and *Congregations contributing to its funds*. The latter, on payment of an annual subscription of not less than £3, or the proceeds of a collection once in three years, are entitled to send two delegates to the annual meeting of the Association and to its Committee; and the ministers for the time being, of congregations so contributing, are received as Honorary Members of the Association. These privileges it is now proposed to take away. The nature of the proposal which is to be submitted, and the ground on which it rests, will be best understood from the following documents. The Rev. R. Brook Aspland, to whom the first letter is addressed, is the able and efficient Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

"*March* 16, 1866.

"Dear Sir,—We send herewith formal notice of a motion to be made at the next Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. In doing so, we are desired to say that Mr. Bache's motion has necessarily called attention to the position of the Association in relation to the present attitude and wants of our religious denomination. It has long been felt by many of our body that the representative function of the Association is at variance with the undogmatic constitution of our older Churches; and were it not for this feature of it, its other functions and objects would meet from others, as from ourselves, with a much more unreserved sympathy. We are persuaded that the imperfect support of which you have felt yourself obliged to complain, is itself an evidence of wide-spread participation in this feeling. We are not blind to the difficulties involved in the attempt to remove what we feel to be objectionable, but as we are actuated by the same desire for the welfare of the same body of Churches, we cannot believe that the difficulties will prove insuperable. On the contrary, we feel assured that, with the co-operation of the executive, our attempt to overcome them may not only be successful, but may be attended with the best results to the well-being of our Churches.—We are, dear Sir, very truly yours,

"P. W. Clayden,
"E. Enfield,

"The Rev. R. B. Aspland." *Secretaries to the Subscribers.*

"*Nottingham, March* 14, 1866.

"TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

GENTLEMEN,—In compliance with the requirements of the 33rd Rule of the Association, we hereby give notice that it is our intention, through the agency of such of us as may be present, to move and support the following Amendment of its Rules at the forthcoming Annual Meeting.—We are, Gentlemen, yours very respectfully, (Signed)

JOHN JAMES TAYLER,	EDWIN SMITH,	JOHN H. THOM,
W. J. LAMPORT,	E. ENFIELD,	THOS. HINCKS,
JAMES MARTINEAU,	THOMAS SADLER,	J. B. SMITH,
BROOK HERFORD,	W. B. CARPENTER,	R. GREAVES,
JOSEPH LUPTON,	JAMES HEYWOOD,	S. D. DARBISHIRE,
JOHN GORDON,	JAS. STANSFELD, JUN.	EDWIN CHAPMAN,
WM. ENFIELD,	H. C. ROBINSON,	JOHN BOWRING,
P. W. CLAYDEN,	EDMUND POTTER,	GEORGE HOPE,
CHARLES BEARD,	JAMES STANSFELD,	CHARLES CLARKE,
J. LETTIS SHORT,	PHILIP WORSLEY,	T. HIRST SMYTH,
A. W. WORTHINGTON,	CHARLES PAGET,	J. W. DOWSON,
W. S. COOKSON,	HERBERT NEW,	J. P. MALLESON.

"COPY OF THE RESOLUTION.

"*That, whereas the greater part of the Congregations in which at present Unitarian opinions prevail, inheriting a constitution free from doctrinal restriction, cannot consistently identify themselves, as Congregations, with any particular variety of Protestant Theology, and narrow their latitude by assuming its doctrinal name;*

"*This Association, formed exclusively for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity, cannot properly assume any representative function with regard to them; and that the 2nd Paragraph of the 3rd Rule, defining the terms of such representation, together with the prior and subsequent words referring to it, according to the annexed schedule, be cancelled from the Rules of the Association.*"

It is scarcely necessary to point out the undisguised contempt for the rules of logic which the foregoing correspondence betrays. Granting the writers all that they venture to affirm, they only say—"*Some* congregations are precluded from connecting themselves with a dogmatic Association:" and when from this they infer that "*no congregation whatsoever* should be allowed so to connect itself," they make a bold leap from the particular to the universal, such as every treatise on the art of reasoning reprobates and explodes. It is evident, from the terms employed in their own documents, that the writers know very well that not a few of the Unitarian congregations in Great Britain assemble in chapels which are strictly tied up to the maintenance of Unitarian doctrine

and worship. Are these to be excluded for ever from the privilege of subscribing to the funds of a Unitarian Association, or sending delegates to its annual meeting? The very idea is preposterous.

But there are also congregations which have "inherited a constitution free from doctrinal restriction;" or in other words, hold their property upon open trusts. Are these prevented from avowing their adherence to "Unitarian Christianity," or any other form of Christian doctrine which their members from time to time may approve; or from joining in an Association for the purpose of more effectually promoting such form of doctrine? We say, no; emphatically no. They are free churches; they are bound by no doctrinal restriction; therefore they are at liberty to avow whatever doctrines seem to them to be consistent with the Gospel, and to do whatever they deem calculated to extend their growth. They cannot, indeed, limit the freedom of their successors in this respect. But when they subscribe their own money, and send their representatives to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, they are not controlling the liberty of posterity; they are simply exercising their own. Their posterity may, if they please, unite themselves with a body of Calvinists to promote Calvinism, or with a body of Wesleyans to promote Arminianism; but the present generation, being of Unitarian sentiments, are free to join with their Unitarian brethren to advance the opinions which they hold in common. To prevent them from doing so, when they have the opportunity, the inclination, and the means, is to debar them from the exercise of that religious freedom which their ancestors intended to bequeath to them, by transmitting to them their churches and chapels upon open trusts.

The framers of the proposed rule are far from carrying out their own principle to its legitimate conclusion. Their principle is that *all connexion* with a dogmatic or doctrinal Association is inconsistent with the provisions of an open trust. Their conclusion is that the *right of representation* in the meetings of the Association shall be withheld from congregations having such trusts, or as they themselves express it, from all congregations whatsoever. Now this conclusion is not broad enough. It

ought to go much farther. It ought to restrain the Committee from accepting an annual subscription from such congregations; it ought to forbid the acceptance of a collection in aid of its funds from any such society; it ought to prevent the Association from meeting in any chapel whose trusts are open; it ought to prohibit the minister, the Treasurer, the Secretary, or other recognized officer of any such church from being received as a member of the Association, even upon his own individual subscription. Unquestionably, all these things tend to impress a doctrinal character upon the existing members of the congregation quite as much as the presence of two or three delegates at an anniversary meeting. In fact, if the interpretation put upon the non-doctrinal constitution of certain congregations be the true one, no minister could, in their pulpits, deliver his sentiments on any theological question whatsoever without being guilty of a breach of trust. But who would accept the office of member of Committee in the Association, if, whenever a donation was handed in from the members of a worshipping society in their collective capacity, he were under the necessity of calling for the chapel deeds in order to inquire whether the act of granting it was not a violation of its constitutional charter? Whether, in fact, the tendering of the donation was not an act of fraud?

But the proposers of the new rule declare that its adoption is necessary, in order to secure for the Association "a much more unreserved sympathy from themselves and others." They are persuaded that the imperfect support, of which the Committee has often complained, is an evidence of the wide-spread prevalence of the objection felt, to what they term "the representative character of the Association." We think they are very much mistaken in tracing the smallness of the support vouchsafed to the Association to the "wide-spread prevalence" of any such feeling. We have often held serious and anxious conference with our Unitarian brethren on the subject of this defective support. All have acknowledged it; most have deplored it. We have heard it traced to various causes. Some have ascribed it to the circumstance that the annual meetings are held in London exclusively; some to the inactivity of the Com-

mittee; some to a wide-spread and deep diversity of theological opinion, which prevents any hearty co-operation between persons holding such irreconcilably opposite opinions; some to the utter want of interest felt by the bulk of the Unitarian public in all theological questions, or their progress in the world. We do not affirm the truth of these statements; we are merely reporting them. But no one ever yet, in our hearing, in public or in private, ascribed the want of support experienced by the Association to the circumstance that *five* congregations have the privilege,—of which we do not know that even one has ever availed itself,—of sending two or three deputies each to represent them at its meetings.* We apprehend that not one in five hundred of those wealthy Unitarians who withhold their support from the Association, ever heard, before the publication of these documents, of that rule to which their want of sympathy is ascribed. We observe that several of the gentlemen whose names are appended to the notice of motion are ministers and members of congregations which contribute, and have for years contributed, to the funds of the Association; a proof that in their own localities their views on this point are not prevalent.

AN HONORARY MEMBER.

POSTSCRIPT.—The following has been circulated, as an amendment, which it is in contemplation to propose on the motion of which Mr. Tayler and others have given notice. In the copy that we have seen the words here printed in italics are added in M.S.—

"That the Members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association publicly declare their adhesion to the free and catholic spirit which has generally characterized the Unitarian body.

"That they understand by the words of their foundation Rule, 'the principles of Unitarian Christianity,' not the mere negation of Trinitarianism, but Christianity in its largest sense as held by Unitarians.

"That they have not desired, and do not desire, to bind Congregations or individuals connected in any way with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association to any formal Creed; and that in making grants, whether of money or books, to Congregations and Ministers, they have no intention or desire to impose upon

* There are only five congregations which contribute £3 each to the funds of the Association. Five others contribute smaller sums.

them either at the present time the acceptance of a Creed, or in time future the profession of any particular variety of Protestant theology.

"That this is, in the belief of the members of the Association, the true interpretation of the design and objects of the founders of the Society—and therefore,

"That the alteration in the rules of the Association proposed by the Rev. J. J. Tayler and other friends is unnecessary and inexpedient; *and would, moreover, if adopted, be an injurious interference with the religious liberty of the Congregations which may desire to associate themselves with, or to send delegates to, the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.*"

We should regard the adoption of this amendment as a step fatal to the religious character and usefulness of the Association.

The first paragraph, by the use of the word "generally," distinctly implies that there are some Unitarians who are *not* "characterized by a free and catholic spirit." Under existing circumstances this cannot be understood otherwise than as stigmatizing Mr. Bache and the members who support his views. We consider such an imputation undeserved and unjust; and we hope the meeting will reject it with hearty unanimity.

The second paragraph declares that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association is founded for the promotion of "Christianity *in its largest sense as held by Unitarians;*" that is to say, for the promotion of Christianity as including the views promulgated by such writers as Messrs. Binns, J. Wright, and W. C. Coupland, all of whom deny the special inspiration of Jesus Christ, and some of whom profess that *doubts of the existence of a God* are to be allowed and recognized in the ministers and members of the Christian Church! Can it be expected that such men as Messrs. Madge, Higginson, Bache, and Ham, will continue to be members of a society avowing such objects?

The third paragraph is *à propos* to nothing that appears in the motion which it professes to amend. The motion says not one word about any desire on the part of the Association to impose a creed on congregations; it professes an alarm lest the congregations should impose a creed upon themselves. It says not a word about grants of money from the Association to the churches, but expresses a dread of the consequences that may follow from allowing churches to contribute to the funds of the Association. It expresses no alarm lest ministers and congregations should be bound up to a creed by being supplied with a donation of books for their libraries; indeed the idea of subjecting any man to a creed *by making him a present of a book* is one that is, we believe, quite original with the framers of the

amendment. Illogical as the authors of the motion have shewn themselves, they have been guilty of no such absurdity as this.

The fourth paragraph repeats, in a still more decisive form, the erroneous statement of the first and second.

The fifth, especially if taken with the addition of the words in italics, meets our hearty approval.

H. M.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 86.)

VI.—John Darroch (1688—1689) can scarcely be said to have been the regular minister of Glenarm even during the parts of two years which I have set down as the period of his connexion with that Congregation. Like his immediate predecessor, Mr. Hugh Crawford, he seems to have been no more than the constant supplier of that place, with a view to a settlement there, but never to have been actually ordained or formally designated to Glenarm. There is, however, no doubt that during the two years which I have mentioned, he did officiate in the Congregation whose history I am now writing; and therefore, as well as because his name, connected with Glenarm, occurs on the list of "Presbyterian and orderly Ministers of Ireland," which was furnished to the Scottish General Assembly in May, 1689, I have set him down here as the sixth minister of Glenarm.

Mr. John Darroch, like his predecessors in Glenarm, Messrs. John Anderson and Hugh Crawford, was a Scotchman, who had been driven from his native country to Ireland by the troubles of the times. Whether or not he had been also a placed minister in Scotland does not, in his case, so distinctly appear as it does in the cases of the other two gentlemen above named. On his first coming to Ireland, he seems to have laboured for a time at Dunean, near Randalstown. His connexion with Glenarm took place in the following manner, as recorded in the minutes of the Antrim meeting.

About four months after Mr. Hugh Crawford finally left Glenarm for Scotland, viz., on June 5, 1688, Mr.

John Mitchell, Commissioner from Glenarm, appeared at a meeting of the brethren in Templepatrick, "desiring the advice of the meeting for the settling of Gospel ordinances" amongst the people whom he represented, and "asking for their supply till next meeting." He also stated, at the same time, that "as to Mr. Crawford's arrears they had his discharge for £35 2s. 4d., and the rest they promised to collect with all the care they could." Under these circumstances, the petition for supply seems to have been granted, and it is probable that on this occasion Mr. Darroch was appointed to go to Glenarm. At the next meeting, "no one appearing from that place, the brethren waive at this time till they move, only Mr. Darroch to supply them two Sabbaths." Mr. Darroch was able to visit them only once; but his services then and previously were so acceptable to the people of Glenarm, that at the meeting in August, 1688, Mr. W. Halliday, on the part of that Congregation, particularly desired that Mr. John Darroch might be sent to them as their supply. With this desire the meeting complied, and instructed Mr. Darroch "to give them a Sabbath or two if it stand with his conveniency." They also informed Mr. Halliday that as to arrears "due to Mr. Crawford, they would expect an account at next meeting." At the ensuing meeting, which was held at Templepatrick on September 9, 1688, John Stuart appeared as Elder and Commissioner from Glenarm, "signifying that there was a call drawn and subscribed by the Congregation of Glenarm (though he forgot it) to Mr. John Darroch to be their minister, and desiring that he might be sent to them, and promising against next meeting to have a quota settled for his maintenance. The meeting unanimously agreed in hearkening to their motion, and appointed Mr. Darroch to supply them in Glenarm till next meeting, and to take their call into consideration." At the following meeting of the brethren, which was held in Belfast on October 1, 1688, Mr. John Mitchell attended as Elder from Glenarm. Mr. William Matthews was also present as Commissioner from that Congregation, "signifying that Mr. John Darroch, according to appointment, had taken the call of Glenarm into consideration, and now supplicating the meeting for

his settlement there." At the same time appeared John Hamilton from Layd and Cushendall, two districts of country a few miles north of Glenarm, "concurring with Glenarm in calling Mr. Darroch, and also presenting to him a call from thence, seeking him to preach every fourth Sabbath among them, and promising to contribute proportionably to his maintenance." The same person further presented a letter from Mr. Peter Orr, who was a native of Larne, and at that time minister of Clough, County Antrim, signifying that the meeting of Route (under whose charge Layd and Cushendall seem hitherto to have been placed) "would most probably approve of and concur with Layd and Cushendall's annexation to Glenarm, in respect of Mr. Darroch's having the Irish tongue."* But at this period of the proceedings other parties intervened, who seemed likely at one time to mar the contemplated arrangement. The Congregation of Ballymena, by Commissioners, also presented Mr. Darroch with a call which, they said, had been signed by all their members "excepting only about six persons." Under these circumstances, "the meeting, seriously considering the whole affair, and finding that they had not as yet the consent of the ministers of that part of Scotland where Mr. Darroch came from, and that he is now upon his journey going thither to see his family, will expect that he bring a full and clear testimonial, together

* The study of the Irish language was, from an early period, and on many occasions, strongly recommended by the Synod of Ulster to the young men under its charge, with the view of enabling them to assist in the conversion to Protestantism of the native inhabitants of this country In 1710 an elaborate "scheme for preaching the Gospel among the Irish Papists in their own language," was adopted by this reverend body, and it was then stated that there were at that time, in connexion with the Synod, six Ministers and three Probationers who "had the Irish language." A few years afterwards, efforts in this field of missionary labour were stimulated by the bounty of Dr. Daniel Williams, of Drogheda, Dublin, and London, who bequeathed "the interest of one thousand pounds, for ever, to promote the preaching of Christianity in the Irish language;" and, at a later period, the same work was still further promoted by the publication of Dr. W. Neilson's Irish Grammar. Even so recently as 1828, the Synod "most earnestly recommended to candidates for the ministry to apply themselves to the study of the Irish language." But I fear that, so far as the conversion of the native Irish was concerned, all these measures utterly failed to produce any considerable result; and I do not think that there is now in Ireland a single Presbyterian Minister or Probationer who could preach a sermon or offer up a prayer in the Irish language.

with a full and free liberty from the Church of Scotland, in order to his settlement in Ireland, and if he obtain this and return to this country, and be any Sabbaths here before our meeting, then the meeting thinks it fit to appoint that he may supply Layd and Cushendall one Sabbath, and the rest at Glenarm till he appear before this meeting with the said testimonials; and *that* because Glenarm's call was before any other call, and then the meeting will determine whether he shall accept the call of Glenarm or Ballymena as the Lord shall direct them, only allow him to keep the calls of Glenarm and Cushendall under his consideration till he appear again before us." The call from Ballymena, perhaps in consequence of the foregoing decision, was apparently no further prosecuted, for no more mention is made of it in the minutes; and Glenarm was ordered to be supplied occasionally by Messrs. Campbell of Cairncastle, and Hall of Larne, until Mr. Darroch should return from Scotland. This he appears to have done in December, 1688; for at that time he was appointed "to supply Glenarm and Cushendall, but only till next meeting, when the meeting would expect his testimonials from Scotland." Accordingly at the ensuing meeting, which was held in Belfast on Jan. 1, 1689, and which was attended by Hugh Gib as Elder from Glenarm, it was reported "that Mr. John Darroch had supplied Glenarm and Cushendall only since his return from Scotland, and had brought hither a testimonial allowing his continuance in Ireland to serve in the work of the ministry, with this reservation that the Church of Scotland, and particularly the Presbytery of Kintyre may have access to call him again, when Providence opens a door for his return. The meeting acquiescing therein appointed Mr. John Campbell to repair to Glenarm tomorrow eight days, and after preaching, try the unanimity of that people's call to Mr. Darroch, with the aforesaid proviso, and to see what they are doing for his maintenance, and to make report to next meeting." This appointment Mr. Campbell obeyed, and at the following meeting reported that he had found the call to Mr. Darroch from Glenarm "unanimous with the proviso mentioned therein." He also imformed the meeting that "for maintenance they promise £24. Cushendall pro-

mises a fourth part of stipend farther, upon their being supplied every fourth day, or more if every third day, wherein the meeting acquiesces for the present, as likewise Mr. Darroch. The bonds of each payment they promise to renew every year during his incumbency; and as to Mr. Crawford's arrears they promise to take care of the same, and give an account thereof at the next meeting." But in the minutes of the next meeting no mention is made either of Glenarm or of Mr. Darroch. It is most probable that about this time that gentleman again visited his family in Scotland, and I do not think that he ever returned to his Irish charge of Glenarm cum Layd and Cushendall.* On November 26, 1689, we find Mr. William Halliday, Elder and Commissioner from Glenarm, "desiring the advice of the meeting in order to their settlement with Gospel ordinances, Mr. John Darroch not returning, nor any appearance of it. However, the meeting finding that the people are ready to endeavour his return, allow them to do their utmost diligence for his return, and report to be made." But I have no idea that Mr. Darroch hearkened to the voice of the Glenarm charmers, charming never so wisely; and a final stop must have been put to their importunities by that gentleman's accepting a settlement at Craignish, in Scotland, of which parish he was minister in 1691, and where in all probability he died.

I may here mention that the declaration of the Antrim

* Layd and Cushendall retain, in the present day, few or no traditions of the early existence of Presbyterianism within their bounds. The inhabitants of these districts are now principally Roman Catholics, and although they have amongst them traditions in abundance, they are not Presbyterian traditions. They are older if not better. Stories are indeed occasionally told in this neighbourhood of a few laymen who assembled at prayer-meetings about 1680, in farm houses near Cushendall and Cushendun. These people were doubtless Presbyterians, but they do not seem to have had a house of worship or a placed minister; and their descendants are now, in most cases, members either of the Established or Roman Catholic Church. In later times, I believe, the Presbyterians of this district worshipped in a building which is now occupied as a barn by Mr. Crommelin of Cushendun; and, within the last few years, a small meeting-house, with a neat manse attached, has been built between Cushendall and Cushendun for the accommodation of a Presbyterian congregation in connexion with the General Assembly, whose present minister, Rev. Charles Gillis, kindly but ineffectually made, at my request, minute inquiries as to the early history of Presbyterianism in the romantic district where he lives and labours.

Protestant Association for mutual defence, which was issued by "the Nobility and Gentry of the County of Antrim" in the eventful times of which we are now treating, exhibits, amongst other signatures, those of John Donnelson and George Buttle, who were doubtless members of the Glenarm Congregation.

Between Mr. Darroch's final departure from Glenarm in 1689, and the ordination there of Mr. James Creighton in 1709, occurred an interval of twenty years. With respect to nearly the whole of this period I have little or no information to offer to the reader concerning the history of Glenarm Congregation. Indeed I am not able even to say whether or not, during any portion of this period, the Congregation referred to had the services of a stated pastor. The only original sources of information touching these times to which I have access are the minutes of the Antrim Meeting, which end with 1691, and the minutes of the Templepatrick Presbytery, which do not begin till 1745. From the former record it appears that on the return of Mr. Darroch to Scotland in 1689, Glenarm was occasionally supplied by various ministers in compliance with the appointment of the meeting; and also that, through its Commissioners, Messrs. R. & W. Mathews, John Mitchell, Robert Montgomery, and William Carnegie, it made several attempts to obtain a settled minister. But of these attempts, three at least were unsuccessful; and on all these occasions the people of Glenarm were very plainly told by the meeting that the fault was their own.

The first person of whom, at this time, they asked a hearing, with a view to his settlement amongst them, was Mr. David Airth. This gentleman had been for a few years minister of Glenavy, but having proved to the satisfaction of the brethren that "he was not able to subsist there," he was declared by the meeting to be transportable; and the Glenarm people supposing in their simplicity that a man who could not subsist in Glenavy might yet subsist in Glenarm, entered into negotiations for his location amongst them. But the movement had not the desired result. Indeed the Congregation of Glenarm was not very urgent in the prosecution of its suit

for Mr. Airth. On one occasion we read, "June, 1690. None appears from Glenarm; only a letter by Mr. John Campbell, of Cairncastle, desiring either a further hearing of Mr. David Airth, or supply by some other whom the meeting thinks fit. The meeting thinks fit to appoint them no supply till they appear themselves, and be more express in their desire." Some months afterwards, viz., in January, 1691, the meeting did, on the personal requisition of Robert Montgomery, Commissioner from Glenarm, "appoint Mr. David Airth to be with them on Sabbath eight days, and if they can prevail with him, two." But Mr. Airth did not go to them even once; and shortly afterwards, like the most of the Scottish ministers who had visited Ireland, he returned to his native country, where he died.

(*To be continued.*)

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

A Sunday-School Lesson.—No. 3.

When the infant John had been named, according to the law, those who had heard of the wonderful things connected with his birth, filled with awe, said, "What manner of child shall this be?" whilst his aged father, inspired by the Holy Spirit, prophesied of him that he should be called the prophet of the Highest, for he should go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways. So we find that "the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his shewing unto Israel." It was in the Perea, the country east of Jordan, that John chiefly dwelt, not in kings' palaces, nor wearing soft raiment, but in a wild, half-cultivated, and thinly inhabited part of the land, having but little intercourse with his fellow-men, but full of meditation and prayer, and thus preparing himself by habits of the most rigid self-denial for the great work to which God, even before his birth, had called him, that of preparing the way for the great Messiah, being the voice of one crying in the wilderness to make the crooked straight and the rough places plain, that all flesh might see the salvation of the

Lord. And here we find an evident and beautiful allusion to the eastern custom of sending "messengers" before the face of great monarchs, to take away all hindrances from their paths, to level every obstruction, that their progress might be easy and pleasant. So John came in the spirit and power of Elijah the great Jewish prophet, to prepare men's hearts for Jesus who was the Lord's Christ or anointed. So he was the messenger of the covenant, and so he proclaimed that men should come to him for the baptism of repentance, that thus they might be saved from the wrath to come. Thus for many years was John an inhabitant of the desert country; not that we are to suppose he never came into towns or among the dwellings of men, but the wilderness was his chosen place of residence, for there, in solitude and in silence, he could best commune with God and his own heart, and probably there could best receive those lessons of divine instruction so necessary for his future life. He had a very peculiar and a very difficult work to do: his whole heart and soul and strength must be given to it, and hence his seclusion from all the concerns of the present world. Our Lord was brought up differently, in a city—though a small one—and in the midst of his fellow-men, to shew, it may be, that his disciples were to live in the world and in society, that amidst these were their duties and their trials, and that each one of them was to endeavour to leave the world better than he found it; and we see in each case, that of Jesus and of the Baptist, that wisdom was "justified of her children." In each the purposes of Divine Providence were fully carried out, though those who were determined to find fault would take every opportunity of doing so, however unfair, however malicious the grounds of their accusation.

And now the time came round when John must come forth from his solitude, and, though in the wilderness, mingle with his fellow-men. Hitherto he had been preparing for his duties, and learning how best to discharge them. Now, he was to cry aloud and spare not—to be a watchman to Israel and to herald forth the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven. Leaving the rocks, the valleys, and the vast solitude of the desert, he stands on the banks of the Jordan, and, in stern and thrilling tones,

bids the multitudes who flock around him to repent of their national and their personal sins, assuring them that the axe was laid at the root of the tree; if it continued barren and unprofitable, it must be cut down and cast into the fire. And we can imagine the scene, deeply interesting as it must be to all of us.

> "In Judah's rugged wilderness,
> Where Jordan rolls his flood;
> In manners strict, and rude in dress,
> The holy Baptist stood."

It was at Ænon, near to Salim, that the Baptist stood, because we are told there was much water there; and here the multitudes were plunged into the stream, confessing their sins. Yes, here, with the black frowning mountains of the wilderness surrounding him—with rough stones at his feet, and with the Jordan flowing majestically before him, John, with his raiment of camel's hair and a leathern girdle about his loins, preached and administered the baptism of repentance, warning his hearers to bring forth fruits meet for it; and the people of Jerusalem, of Judea, and the country round Jordan, are present with very various views and feelings. Some, in the pure simplicity of their hearts, devoutly "waiting for the consolation of Israel," and penitently confessing their sins—some with hypocrisy, and some to mock and scorn; the Pharisees, with their sanctimonious garb and countenance; the Sadducees, with the curled and scoffing lip; the Publicans, hardly knowing whether they had any right to be there, so hated were they of all men; the soldiers of Herod, fierce, hard-handed, licentious, regarding none but their leaders, too apt to ravage a country they were sent to protect,—all these stood before the man of God, who fearlessly counselled, warned, and denounced as he saw occasion. And it was in the Jordan, a stream clear, and full, and hallowed by the most sacred recollections, endeared by a thousand memories, that he baptized those who repented of their sins, who earnestly longed for the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. The Jordan was the largest, almost the only river of their land. It was the great line of separation between the fair and fertile provinces of Western Pales-

tine and the more rugged and mountainous eastern part, the Perea, or the *country beyond*. Moses had stood on Pisgah, overlooking this beautiful river, and there had seen the noble inheritance of the tribes, but the waters of Jordan he was not to cross. But Joshua, at the head of the people, had triumphantly marched through it, the waters standing on a heap on either side on the banks of Jordan. Elijah and Elisha stood talking there on the ways of the Lord towards his people, when suddenly the chariot of fire carried the elder prophet to heaven. And in its waters Naaman, the doubting Syrian captain, had bathed seven times and had thus been cleansed of his leprosy. To us the Jordan is yet more dearly associated. Among those who now crowded to the Baptist there was one whom John knew not as yet as the Messiah, yet whom he revered for the sanctity of his life—Jesus, the meek and lowly of heart—who thus fulfilled even the ceremonial righteousness of the law, and who, coming up out of the waters, received the heavenly attestation, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

How long John continued thus publicly to baptize we cannot say. It may not have been many weeks; but during the time he was more than once asked if he were the Christ, and he took the opportunity to refer to Jesus in the remarkable words—"He must increase, but I must decrease." He explicitly declared he was not the Messiah. He pointed out Jesus to his own disciples as the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world. We find the Baptist, after this, in the court of Herod, in the strong fortress of Machærus, near the Dead Sea. First Herod heard him gladly, but, stung by the observations of the Baptist that he ought not to have Herodias, he shut up John in prison, from whence the two disciples were sent to Jesus to know whether he were indeed the Christ. Our Lord referred to his miracles for a reply, and with this we must suppose the holy prophet was satisfied. But the wicked Herodias could not rest till the life of John had been taken away, and we know how; there is no more melancholy history on record, whether we think of the king's criminal weakness, the vindictiveness of Herodias, or the horrid request made by her young daughter to have the head of John the Baptist

given to her in a charger. All parties were fearfully guilty, Herodias the most so: and we turn with loathing from them to John himself, the pious, the rigidly just, who, though he died, retained his integrity. He fell nobly in the cause of truth and righteousness. His memory is eternally that of the just man made perfect.

B.

ECCE HOMO.

Ecce Homo (Behold the Man, John xix. 5) is the title of a book that has excited very general interest, and has accomplished the wonderful feat, hitherto considered almost impossible, of being equally acceptable to the most opposite parties in the Christian Church. We could not afford space enough for a satisfactory analysis or criticism. We cannot give our readers any information as to the author, nor can we quote the book as deriving any authority from the character of its author or the confidence attached to his opinions. It is represented in the preface as a fragment, and an expectation held out of another volume, at some distant time, that will treat of Christ as "the creator of modern theology and religion." And though we think that there are indications of what are called heretical opinions; yet these are so slight, and so little prominent, as to admit of remarkable unanimity in accepting this book as a fair, elegant, and earnestly written statement of the "motives, objects, and feelings of Christ as an historical character."

Instead of attempting any summary of the information to be derived from this book, we must content ourselves with the following extracts as bearing upon an important controversy of the present time—that of miraculous agency on the part of Christ.

It is from the chapter on Christ's Credentials that they are taken. After stating that "to deny that Christ did undertake to form and to legislate for a new theocratic society, and that he did claim the office of judge of mankind, is indeed possible, but only to those who altogether deny the credibility of the extant biographies of Christ. If these biographies be admitted to be generally trust-

worthy, then Christ undertook to be what we have described; if not, then of course this, but also every other account of him, falls to the ground." After this and some other observations on (1) the "prodigious originality" of the scheme, (2) on the calm confidence with which the scheme was carried out, and (3) the prodigious success of the scheme, he proceeds to say, "It is not more certain that Christ presented himself to men as the founder, legislator, and judge of a divine society, than it is certain that men have accepted him in these characters, that the divine society has been founded, that it has lasted nearly two thousand years, that it has extended over a large and the most highly civilized portion of the earth's surface, and that it continues in full vigour to the present day."

"Between the astonishing design and its astonishing success there intervenes an astonishing instrumentality—that of miracles. It will be thought by some that in asserting miracles to have been actually wrought by Christ, we go beyond what the evidence, perhaps beyond what any possible evidence, is able to sustain. Waiving, then, for the present the question whether miracles were actually wrought, we may state a fact which is fully capable of being established by ordinary evidence, and which is actually established by evidence as ample as any historical fact whatever—the fact, namely, that Christ *professed* to work miracles. We may go farther, and assert with confidence that Christ was believed by his followers really to work miracles, and that it was mainly on this account that they conceded to him the pre-eminent dignity and authority which he claimed. The account we have of these miracles may be exaggerated; it is possible that in some special cases stories have been related which have no foundation whatever; but on the whole, miracles play so important a part in Christ's scheme that any theory which would represent them as due entirely to the imagination of his followers, or of a later age, destroys the credibility of the documents not partially but wholly, and leaves Christ a personage as mythical as Hercules. . . . Now if the character depicted in the Gospels is in the main real and historical, they must be generally trustworthy, and, if so, the responsibility of miracles is fixed on Christ. In this case the reality of miracles themselves

depends in a great degree on the opinion we form of Christ's veracity, and this opinion must arise gradually from the careful examination of his whole life."

Again, "It was neither for his miracles nor for the beauty of his doctrine that Christ was worshipped. Nor was it for his winning personal character, nor for the persecutions he endured, nor for his martyrdom. It was for the inimitable unity which all these things made when taken together. In other words, it was for this that he whose power and greatness, as shown in his miracles, were overwhelming, denied himself the use of his power, treated it as a slight thing, walked among men as though he were one of them, relieved them in distress, taught them to love each other, bore with undisturbed patience a perpetual hailstorm of calumny; and when his enemies grew fiercer, continued still to endure their attacks in silence, until, petrified and bewildered with astonishment, men saw him arrested and put to death with torture, refusing steadfastly to use, in his own behalf, the power he conceived he held for the benefit of others. It was the combination of greatness and self-sacrifice which won their hearts, the mighty powers held under a mighty controul, the unspeakable condescension, the *cross of Christ*. By this and nothing else the enthusiasm of a Paul was kindled. The statement rests on no hypothesis or conjecture. His epistles bear testimony to it throughout. . . . And what Paul constantly repeats in impassioned language, the other Apostles echo. Christ's voluntary surrender of power is their favourite subject, the humiliation implied by his whole life and crowned by his death. . . . If we suppose that Christ really performed no miracles, and that those which are attributed to him were the product of self-deception, mixed in some proportion or other with imposture, then no doubt the faith of St. Paul and St. John was an empty chimera, a mere misconception; but it is none the less true that these apparent miracles were essential to Christ's success, and that had he not pretended to perform them, the Christian Church would never have been founded, and the name of Jesus of Nazareth would be known at this day only to the curious in Jewish antiquities."

"To sum up the results of this chapter [on the credentials of Christ], we begin by remarking that an astonishing plan met with an astonishing success, and we raised the question to what instrumentality that success was due. Christ announced himself as the Founder and Legislator of a new Society and as the Supreme Judge of men. Now, by what means did he procure that these immense pretensions should be allowed? He might have done it by sheer power; he might have adopted persuasion, and pointed out the merits of the scheme and of the legislation he proposed to introduce. But he adopted a third plan, which had the effect not merely of securing obedience, but of exciting enthusiasm and devotion. He laid men under an immense obligation. He convinced them that he was a person of altogether transcendent greatness, one who needed nothing at their hands, one whom it was impossible to benefit by conferring riches, or fame, or dominion upon him, and that, being so great, he had devoted himself of mere benevolence to their good. He showed them that, for their sakes, he lived a hard and laborious life, and exposed himself to the utmost malice of powerful men . . . witnessing his sufferings, and convinced by the miracles they saw him work, that they were voluntarily endured,—men's hearts were touched, and pity for weakness blending strangely with wondering admiration of unlimited power; an agitation of gratitude, sympathy, and astonishment, such as nothing else could ever excite, sprang up in them, and when turning from his deeds to his words, they found this very self-denial which had guided his own life prescribed as the principle which should guide their gratitude, broke forth in joyful obedience. Self-denial produced self-denial, and the Law and Lawgiver together were enshrined in their inmost hearts for inseparable veneration."

These extracts are all from the chapter on the Credentials of Christ: and our reason for selecting them is their bearing upon the disputed question of the Christian miracles. The author has obviously no sympathy with the presumptuous argument of the impossibility of miracles. He maintains it to be a fact established by evidence as ample as any historical fact whatever,—that Christ *professed* to work miracles—that he was believed by his fol-

lowers to work miracles, and that it was mainly on this account that they conceded to him the pre-eminent dignity and authority which he claimed; and, further, that if the character depicted in the Gospels is in the main real and historical, the responsibility of miracles is fixed on Christ.

He admits, on the other hand, in opposition to those who contend for the plenary inspiration of Scripture, that it is possible that "in some special cases stories have been related which have no foundation whatever," but that any theory that would ascribe them entirely to the imagination of his followers, or of a later age, destroys the credibility of the documents, not partially but wholly. With this intermediate opinion we are inclined to agree: for though, on the recognized principles of biblical criticism, we cannot go farther back than the most ancient manuscripts, we must admit the possibility of interpolations prior to their date. We may admit that, with the utmost care and scrutiny by the writers of the Gospels, as appears from a comparison with the apocryphal Gospels, &c., there may have crept in sometimes an exaggeration, or even an error, in the admissions of reports and traditions. We do not say that such a case has ever been made out, or is likely to be so; but even if it were so, it would not invalidate our conviction that Jesus Christ did work miracles, and appeal to them in support of his pretensions to the authority which he claimed. Some, at least, of those who repudiate the miracles maintain the highest estimate of Christ's character and teachings, yet they must refuse to him the character of sincerity and veracity when he claims the power of working miracles with a consciousness of imposture, and alleges this power as the foundation of his authority and his teaching. These points have been well brought out by the few who have had the manliness to stand forward in vindication of their great Master's character and teaching, such as Messrs. Bache, Madge, and Panton Ham.

It is a very prevalent mistake that, by maintaining Mr. Bache's principles, we should be restricting the right of private judgment in belief and worship; but we presume that no one questions the right of any other to frequent what place of worship he prefers, without questioning as to his belief. We have no "fencing," to use a Scotch

phrase, of our places of worship; but every one is at perfect liberty to avail himself of the offices and ordinances of our religious Societies, as far as his own conscience or desire of improvement will allow.

The question at issue relates entirely to "Associations" for religious purposes, as with us to our association in Presbyteries,—and the connexion of a minister and his Congregation, and our Unitarian Societies; or, with our English brethren—the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, the Provincial Assembly of Lancashire and Cheshire, and several others. These are in general Missionary Societies for propagating Christianity. How can they co-operate in this when one party would rely on the credibility of the New Testament, and enforce its teachings as an authoritative communication by one that was specially commissioned for this purpose; and the other would cast the New Testament aside as full of myths and fables, or be exposed to the unanswerable retort, How can you ask us to believe in a book that you yourself represent to be in so many important matters untrustworthy and false? Or how are we to read for our own edification? How are we to inculcate the reading of this book in our families? How are we to read or listen to the reading of this book in public worship? How are we, in our own discussions, to use the words of this book as proving or disproving any doctrine, if we reject so large a portion as must be rejected, when we deny the truth of the miracles recorded? If we eliminate from the New Testament all the accounts of miraculous agency, and all that pre-supposes a miraculous interference, how much will be left for our edification and guidance? These considerations include the Epistles and Acts as well as the Gospels; and the author of this book represents this strongly in a passage which we have quoted.

CONTEMPLATED CHANGES IN THE UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The Rev. J. Martineau has published, in *The Theological Journal*, a paper, since copied into *The Inquirer*, entitled "The Living Church Through Changing Creeds," the drift of which seems to be to prepare the way for a fundamental change in the status of the Unitarian Body in England. He admits the impossibility of sub-

stituting the vague platitudes of the "advanced school" for the more precise obligations of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association and its fundamental principles, so often recorded in its reports, and therefore suggests the propriety of establishing a new Association, the catholicity of whose principles must of course admit of Trinitarians and Anti-Trinitarians, whether Arians, Humanitarians, Pantheists, or Secularists; for, as all shades of exclusion must be avoided, there can be no exception made. Simultaneously with this expression of Mr. Martineau's views, a notice was given by a number of ministers and laymen—prominent among them the professors of Manchester New College—that a resolution would be moved at the next annual meeting of the Association, recommending a change in the rules. This document has been examined, and its objectionable character exposed, in another part of our present number; but we have learned that, on Wednesday, the 18th ult., several of the gentlemen who signed this document met the Committee of the Association, with a view to some friendly understanding on the important questions respecting the future position of the Association. After a discussion of some five hours, a committee was appointed, consisting of Messrs. J. Martineau, J. J. Tayler, P. W. Clayden, and E. Enfield, to consult with the Committee of the Association. The joint Committees met on the following Friday, and we learn from *The Inquirer* that the proceedings were characterised by a most friendly spirit, and a marked desire on both sides to find a basis of common union, so as either to render the foundation of a new society unnecessary, or, if the present Association cannot be remodelled, to prepare the way for a new representative society which should not interfere with the definite functions of the existing Association. We are told that, after a careful discussion of the whole question, a resolution was unanimously adopted, of which the following is the substance, to be submitted to the annual meeting as the joint resolution of the two Committees:—

"That, having regard to the constitution and history of the Presbyterian and other Non-Subscribing Congregations, a Committee be appointed to consider how far the British and Foreign Unitarian Association can be modified, so as more completely to meet the wants and acquire the confidence and support of all liberal Christian churches, or to suggest a division of work between two agencies that should coexist in friendly relations to each other."

We cannot believe that those who attach importance to Unitarian Christianity will submit to have the Association stripped of its doctrinal character, or overridden by some new society which shall have no belief and perhaps no Christ as a foundation. A representative association, such as is hinted at, would be something of the same character as our own Non-Subscribing Association, but without the Scriptures as its basis, and without Christ as the corner stone. Even with these essential elements of a Christian Association, the Irish Body is at present utterly disqualified for missionary effort, and is little better than a Religious Liberty Society. What good, then, could be expected from an English organization whose members would possibly agree only in admitting that the world has a Creator and man a soul?

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC MISSION TO THE POOR OF BELFAST.

On Tuesday evening, April 10, the Annual Meeting of the friends and supporters of the above Mission was held in the Mission Rooms, Stanhope Street, the Rev. Wm. Bruce, President, in the chair.

The meeting having been opened with praise and prayer, the chairman said that the Domestic Mission to the Poor of Belfast was organised at a meeting of the members of the First and Second Presbyterian Congregations, held in the month of April, 1853. This was the thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Mission, and he was happy to say that they had been advancing from year to year, and that they had now got up a school and a place of worship. It would be seen that they were prepared to assist only a small district. He considered that any person who sustained and brought up a single family from the depths of poverty and vice, and made them respectable members of society, did more good than a person who distributed money amongst a multitude of people. The Secretary (Mr. James M. Darbishire) read the report of the Managing Committee, and also the report of the Ladies' General Committee, which, among other matters, stated that "the Female Mission Agency had been carried on since last report in its former course of subordinate usefulness. The same Bible-woman was employed, and continued to give much satisfaction to her lady superintendents and Mr. Bowring. The sewing class for young women employed in mills, and who are connected with the Society, had been continued this winter. Enrolled members being provided with work prepared for them, they could thus, by their own industry, obtain clothing at a slight reduction allowed by the Committee, the loss being borne by the funds of the Female Mission." The Treasurer (Mr. William Campbell) read the statement of accounts, from which it appeared that the receipts during the past year amounted to £229 16s. 6d., and the expenditure to £294 16s.

The Rev. T. Bowring, district missionary, then addressed the meeting, and referred at great length to his operations during the past year. He had made upwards of three thousand visits, and the meetings which he held were all well attended; he concluded by strongly urging the claims of the Society on those present.

The reports and statement of accounts were adopted on the motion of Mr. W. Hartley, seconded by Mr. H. Darbishire. The Rev. C. J. M'Alester moved, and Mr. J. A. Marshall seconded, a resolution respecting the value of the Mission, and the duty of supporting it and extending its operations. A resolution, acknowledging the services of the Rev. T. Bowring, the missionary of the Society, was proposed by Mr. J. Campbell, and seconded by Mr. L. Drennan. The Rev. J. S. Porter referred to several earnest supporters of the Institution that had been removed by death, and concluded by proposing a resolution, which was seconded by Mr. M. Andrews, expressive of the loss which the Mission had recently sustained in the death of Valentine Whitla, Esq., by whose liberality it had been so materially aided. Officers for the ensuing year having been appointed, the proceedings were closed with prayer.

MANCHESTER DISTRICT SUNDAY SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

On Good Friday, March 30, the twenty-first annual meeting of this Association was held in Manchester. The day being fine, and the place of meeting central, the attendance was unusually large. The religious service was held in Cross Street Chapel. The sermon, preached by the Rev. J. L. Short, of Sheffield, was an earnest appeal on behalf of religious education. At the close of the service 550 teachers and friends took dinner at the Lower Mosley Street Schools.

At two o'clock the usual meeting for the transaction of the business of the Association was held in the Memorial Hall, Albert Square, Mr. R. D. Darbishire, B.A., president, in the chair. After an introductory address by the chairman, in which he dwelt at some length on the condition and prospects of the Association, the Rev. S. A. Steinthal rose, and after referring, in a feeling address, to the late Mr. Travers Madge, who had been for many years an earnest worker among them, he moved that the following resolution be placed on the minutes:—"That the members and friends of the Manchester District Sunday School Association, feeling that in the death of the late Travers Madge they have sustained a more than common bereavement, would gratefully place upon record their deep sense of the self-sacrificing purity of his life, which has been so early closed on earth. While grieving over the loss that has fallen on them, in common with all his friends, they would reverently thank God for the living and Christ-like influence that has gone forth from him into the hearts of many, and which still lives and must live amongst those for whom he spent himself in loving energy and unflagging zeal." This resolution was seconded by Mr. R. Wade, supported by Mr. J. Glossop, and carried, at the request of the chairman, by all standing up in silence.

Mr. Jessie Pilcher, Secretary, read the annual report, and Mr. J. Higgin submitted the financial statement, both of which were adopted. Resolutions were passed appointing officers for the next year, thanking Mr. Short for his sermon, and welcoming Mr. J. M. Wade as a deputation from the London Sunday-School Association, and Mr. M. Richards as representative of the North Midland Sunday School Association. Mr. Wade and Mr. Richards spoke at some length in acknowledging the motion of welcome, and Mr. Short, in replying to the vote of thanks he had received, dwelt on the necessity of giving a more decidedly religious impression to our Sunday Schools.

The evening meeting was held in the Memorial Hall at six o'clock, Charles Herford, Esq., presiding. After an introductory address from the chair, the Rev. R. Pilcher was called on to read a paper on "What is Religious Education, and how is it to be given to our Sunday Schools?" After the reading of the paper, the subject was discussed by the Revs. C. Beard, W. Binns, T. E. Poynting, B. Herford, S. A. Steinthal and Messrs. Thomas Thornley, J. Glossop, and S. Smith. Mr. Pilcher briefly recapitulated the points which he had endeavoured to illustrate in his paper, after which the proceedings of the day were closed by the singing of the Evening Hymn, and prayer by the Rev. J. Drummond.

OBITUARY

Death of James Grimshaw, Esq.—Died, on March 25, at Whitehouse, James Grimshaw, Esq., at the patriarchal age of 94 years. On the ensuing Wednesday morning his mortal remains were accompanied to the burying-ground, Carnmoney, by a numerous body of relations and friends. The deceased was the eldest son of Mr. Nicholas Grimshaw, who was the first to introduce cotton spinning into this country as a regular branch of trade. By judicious energy and skill this branch of industry became much extended, and bleaching and dyeing being superadded, a great amount of employment was given to the inhabitants of the neighbourhood, in whose welfare the deceased gentleman always took a lively interest. To indefatigable industry in business he united an exemplary attention to the working classes, both in supplying employment and providing for their education, contributing more than any other individual to the improvement of the immediate neighbourhood, and exerting himself successfully through a long life in promoting concord and Christian charity among the mixed community employed by him. In politics, Mr. Grimshaw was an advanced liberal. He preserved his consistency during very stormy periods, and, though not what is called a public man, he took very great interest in the promoting of every legitimate project which he thought had a tendency to meliorate the condition of his countrymen. When a mere boy, he was enrolled among the Volunteers of 1782, and preserved throughout his life a keen appreciation of the principles of that Association. Mr. Grimshaw was one of that noble band who, in opposition to self-interest, took a manly stand against the introduction of the Slave Trade into Belfast, thereby preventing the opprobrium which would otherwise have been attached to our native town. In the cause of Catholic Emancipation, Mr. Grimshaw used great exertions in forwarding petitions from the religious denomination to which he belonged.

About the year 1812, Mr. Grimshaw and his family built what was at that time one of the best school-houses in the North of Ireland for the education of the working classes; and it is worth while to remark, that when the rules of the National Board of Education were suspended on its walls, they but embodied the principles in which the school had been uniformly conducted. This school for many years was entirely supported by Mr. Grimshaw, and almost the last act of his life was the granting a sum of money to enlarge the premises. Mr. Grimshaw was for many years an Elder in the Second Presbyterian Congregation (Unitarian), Rosemary Street, and like that of the denomination to which he belonged, his religion was sedate, sober, and rational, but never obtrusive. He followed the great Christian rule of doing unto others as we would that they should do unto us. He claimed for himself the right of serving God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and held that all others are entitled to the same right. Those who were privileged to hold intercourse with him in private life, saw in the domestic circle a thousand endearing traits, which only there

had their full development. The genial kindness of disposition, the cheerful temperament, the thoroughly Irish enjoyment of a joke, these and many other "trivial fond records" are written in the hearts of loving friends, and there must be permitted to remain.

JARED SPARKS, LL.D.—Died, on March 14th, aged 77 years, Dr. Jared Sparks. This distinguished American divine and scholar was ordained as pastor in the First Independent Church in Baltimore, in 1819. It was on this occasion the late Dr. Channing preached the powerful sermon on Unitarian Christianity, which caused so much excitement and interest at the time, and gave a fresh impulse to the Unitarian controversy. Mr. Sparks remained four years in Baltimore, during which, in addition to his professional duties, he edited *The Unitarian Miscellany*, and published various controversial tracts called forth in defence of the religious faith he had espoused. In 1823, on account of impaired health, he resigned his pastoral charge. He afterwards devoted himself to literary pursuits, and published numerous volumes of American biography, including the lives of Washington and Franklin. He became Professor of Ancient and Modern History, and afterwards, in 1849, was elected President of Harvard University. He was a man of rare attainments, of unaffected humility, and of a devout and reverent spirit. In his views of Scripture and of Christ he belonged to the school of Ware and Channing, and ever steadfastly manifested his profound religiousness of mind by a regular attendance on the ordinances of the sanctuary, as well as by the whole tone of his speech and the whole tenor of his life.

Died, on April 15th, at Exeter, the Rev. Benjamin Mardon, M.A., formerly minister of the Unitarian Chapel, Union Street, Glasgow, and afterwards of Worship Street Chapel, London, aged 74 years.

Died, on March 26th, aged 51 years, the Rev. Dr. Harrison, formerly of Chowbent, and more recently of Brixton and Ipswich.

Died, on April 12, at his residence, Wilmont, Belfast, James Bristow, Esq., Director of the Northern Bank, aged 71 years. Mr. Bristow was connected with the Northern Bank since the year 1827, or about thirty-nine years, having been previously Mr. Batt's confidential clerk in the Belfast Bank of Messrs. Batt, Houston, Gordon, & Crawford, from its commencement. No man was more ready to give judicious aid to the upright and energetic merchant; but, on the other hand, none felt more indignant at any breach of commercial morality. It may truly be said that Mr. Bristow was the patron of enterprise, when that enterprise was founded on sound and legitimate principle; and yet, with all his desire to give impetus to extending commerce, he had a determined feeling against the speculative and the theoretic.

ERRATA.—In the April number the following corrections should be made:—P. 89, lines 7 and 8, read "we cannot enter upon it at all." P. 89, line 18, for "substantialy" read "substantially." P. 90, line 8 from the bottom, for "translations" read "transcriptions." P. 92, line 5, for "subsequently" read "substantially."

The Monthly Summary of Intelligence held over for want of space.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] JUNE, 1866. [No. 5.

A FACT AND ITS LESSON.

WHEN Martin Luther unfurled the banner of the Reformation, he inscribed conspicuously on its folds two great principles—"The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture as a rule of faith and practice," and "the Right of Private Judgment in matters of religion." These principles are the very essence of Protestantism, and the more closely members of reformed churches adhere to them, the more consistently they may bear the Protestant name. It is unfortunately true that some who claim to be regarded as Protestants make private judgment their sole rule both of faith and duty, and attach no authority to the teachings of Scripture; and it is also true that many, erring in the opposite direction, are not satisfied with the Holy Scriptures, but make a belief in certain creeds and articles a condition of membership in a church which, nevertheless, they consider not only as Protestant, but Protestant in the highest and purest sense. It seems strange that intelligent and Christian men should so far misapprehend principles which they acknowledge, as directly to violate them by setting up Confessions of Faith, and making a belief in these a test of church membership. "The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture," in its obvious meaning, excludes from all authority as a rule of faith, the creeds and articles which churches have introduced. These may be useful as explanations of Scripture, but it is anti-Protestant to raise them into a test, and exclude from church privileges all who will not accept them. In this matter the Church of England is grossly inconsistent, for it imposes on its members thirty-nine articles, three creeds, each of them inconsistent with the other two, and a service-book which, with much that

is beautiful and impressive, contains some things that savour more of the Missal than of the Bible. So also is the Presbyterian Church of Scotland; for, while it prides itself in its Protestantism, it demands, on the part of ministers, elders, and communicants, a profession of their belief in the numerous and perplexing propositions of the Westminster Confession, including election, reprobation, and the damnation of all heathens. The same is true of the Irish Presbyterian Church, represented by the General Assembly. Other nominally Protestant churches, as the English Independents, and the majority of the Baptists, so far violate these principles as to superadd to the Scriptures certain articles of belief, without the acknowledgment of which there can be no membership.

Some churches, however, have adopted a truly Protestant basis in making a reception of "the Holy Scriptures the only rule of faith and practice" their principle of organization, and rejecting all human creeds and tests. Such were the English Presbyterians of a past age; and many of the churches which they founded, having what are commonly termed "open trusts," continue to afford to their members the truly Protestant freedom for which worthy men in an earlier age nobly contended. Such, also, are some of the Presbyterian churches in Ulster, and in other parts of Ireland, based on the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, and leaving the members through successive generations to alter or modify their views of Christian truth, providing only that they shall still make the Scriptures their rule of faith and duty. We believe, also, that in the New England States many of the Congregational Churches have a similar foundation, and enjoy a freedom which is denied to the majority of nominally Protestant Churches both in the Old World and the New.

We do not stop to show the reasonableness of maintaining, in its simplicity and force, the sufficiency of Holy Scripture. If we regard the Scriptures as possessing, in any sense, divine authority, or embodying, in any form, a divine revelation, they are obviously distinguishable from ordinary compositions, however ancient or important; and the same arguments by which Luther and his fellow-reformers swept away the authority of Fathers and of Councils, might, with equal force, be applied to the removal

of creeds and confessions which have since been imposed on Christian Churches. If there be those among professing Christians who do not regard the Scriptures as embodying a divine revelation, they should oppose, as strenuously as the Roman Catholic, though from a very different stand-point, such a principle as the "sufficiency of Scripture," and rest their organization, if they wish to have any, on "absolute religious liberty."

But an important fact, to which we desire to direct the attention of our readers, is that, in general, when a congregation of Protestants have been bound by no creed or confession, but have accepted the Scriptures as their only rule of faith, they have, by degrees, abandoned their Trinitarian and Calvinistic theology, and adopted the doctrines of Christian Unitarianism. It may be said that sometimes, in the exercise of an unfettered freedom, congregations or individuals have gone further, and virtually abandoned Christianity; but if that has ever been so, it has been by their casting aside not only their Trinitarian theology, but the authority of Scripture too; for we boldly affirm that none can reject the Christian religion in its truths and promises, and all the while hold by the Scriptures as their rule of faith.

Here, then, is a fact which might be largely illustrated by reference to churches in Ireland, England, the United States of America, and, indeed, to churches on the European Continent also—that where congregations have been organized on the foundation of Scripture only, they have gradually become Unitarian. The great majority of the Unitarian Congregations in England owe their origin to this source; and it is well known that where subscription was relaxed, or entirely given up, in the General Synod of Ulster, the congregations, in many cases, ceased to be Trinitarian. We do not, of course, say that this was uniformly the case, but it was so to a great extent; although the influence of neighbouring Trinitarian churches, the prevailing public opinion, and, till a comparatively recent period, the state of the law, helped to counteract Unitarian tendencies.

The lesson which we draw from this fact is, that the Scriptures, read and studied apart from the creeds and articles which profess to elucidate them, distinctly teach

that God is one being in one person, and that Jesus Christ is not God, but his Son—his only-begotten Son. We cannot conceive how a child or youth, as he reads over the pages of the New Testament, could ever adopt the opinion that he who came from God, prayed to him, taught in his name, died, and was raised from the dead, was the very God from whom he came, to whom he prayed, and by whom he was brought from the dead. We cannot conceive how any one, from perusing the Scriptures, and diligently and devoutly studying them, could ever form the idea of Three Persons subsisting in One Godhead. Not only is the word "Trinity" not to be found, but the dogma or theory which it is employed by theologians to express, is not there. Let the simple Protestant principle of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scripture be consistently acted on in all Protestant Churches, and is to us obvious enough that they must gradually lose their Trinitarianism, and come into the plain and Scriptural views of Unitarian Christianity.

The fact which we have here stated, that Scriptural Churches, fettered by no creed, all tend to Unitarianism, and the lesson we deduce, that the Scriptures plainly teach the Unitarian doctrine, might be brought forward to show that those who desire to promote Unitarian Christianity should seek to organize, not a Unitarian Church, but only a Christian Church with the Scriptures at its foundation, and with no creed to restrict it: but when men, through patient study and much sacrifice, have reached to the apprehension of God's unity, and freed their mind and their heart from the perplexing and contradictory dogmas which so extensively prevail to the injury of the Gospel and to the spread of unbelief, it is right that they should cling to the truth they have found, and labour by all the means they possess to spread it among their fellow-Christians. Hence the wisdom of Unitarian Societies and Unitarian publications—hence the importance of meeting the prevalent religious errors by arguments drawn from reason and revelation. But the Christian Unitarian, however zealous to spread views which he values, should never seek to impose them on others, to bind the future members of his church to their belief, or to imitate some of his Trinitarian neighbours by

withholding the Christian name from all who cannot agree with him, and presumptuously dooming them to everlasting misery.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 130.)

The next person whom the Glenarm people thought of as their minister was Mr. Neal Gray. This gentleman had been placed at Augher, County Tyrone, but at the time of which we are now speaking he was in Scotland, whence all attempts to bring him back to Ireland were utterly ineffectual. In reply to their first application for a hearing of Mr. Gray, the people of Glenarm were told by the meeting that "if they unanimously gave a call to Mr. Gray and wrote to him, Mr. Hall, of Larne, was appointed to write with them." But in the case of Mr. Gray, as in the previous case of Mr. Airth, the hot love of the Glenarm Congregation seems soon to have cooled, for at the following meeting, "none appearing from Glenarm, and the meeting having experience of that people's instability in the like case, they can't proceed in that affair to Mr. Neal Gray, and if Mr. Hall hath not already written, he is enjoined not to do so." So that here Mr. Gray's name also disappears from the history of the Glenarm Congregation.

Thus foiled in two attempts to procure a minister, the people of Glenarm made yet a third endeavour towards the same object. On this occasion their choice fell on Mr. Peter Orr, who (as I have stated) was a native of Larne, and at this time the minister of Clough, in County Antrim. The Glenarm Congregation having sent Commissioners to the meeting in March, 1691, "supplicating supply, and for concurrence and advice in a call to Mr. Peter Orr," the meeting appointed Mr. Campbell, of Cairncastle, "to try the unanimity of their call to Mr. Orr; to help to put it in form, and write with it, in name of this meeting, to the meeting of Route, and to Mr. Orr." This Mr. Campbell did; and at next meet-

ing "reported that he had received an answer from Mr. Thomas Boyd of the Route meeting, stating that although they were loth to part with Mr. Orr, yet if he could not comfortably stay with them, they would not cross the design of the Antrim Meeting in that affair." But before taking any further steps in the matter the brethren demanded from Route a more definite reply, which came two months afterwards by the hands of Mr. Orr himself, and was unfavourable to that gentleman's transportation from Clough to Glenarm; so that here again the latter Congregation was doomed to disappointment.

But still the people of Glenarm did not despair. They made even a fourth attempt to procure a minister; and of their four attempts, at this time, the fourth is the only one in which there are any grounds for thinking that they succeeded. Having, in August, 1691, again referred to the meeting for advice, Mr. John Lee, who seems to have been a probationer, was recommended to them, "to whom they agreed, and immediately wrote to Mr. Lee, showing that they would be ready to give him a call when he had passed his trials." To this overture Mr. Lee's first answer was "not satisfying;" and the people of Glenarm persisting in their desire of him, the meeting appointed one of their number to write to Mr. Lee the second time in their favour." But what was the nature of that gentleman's reply to this second application I cannot tell, for just at this date the Minute Book of the Antrim Meeting ends, and I have no other means of knowing positively whether or not Mr. Lee was ever minister of Glenarm. I am, however, inclined to think that he was. In the first place, it is not likely that this congregation would be left without a pastor for the entire space of twenty years; and, in the next place, the Session Book of the Larne congregation makes mention, more than once, between the years 1699 and 1701, of a Mr. John Lee who was at that time the Clerk of the Antrim Meeting. Under date April 27, 1701, Robert Murdoch reported to the Larne session "that he had attended the Presbytery at Glenarm, but could not get Mr. John Lee, Clerk of the Presbytery, at leisure to give an extract of the ordination." This, I am aware, does not prove that Mr. John Lee was the minister of Glenarm; but it proves that, at the time re-

ferred to, he was minister somewhere within the bounds of the Antrim Meeting; and, taken in connexion with what has been already quoted from the minutes of that Meeting respecting his invitation to Glenarm, I think it makes it very probable that he was located there; in which case his name ought to have appeared on our list as the seventh minister of that congregation. Respecting, however, the events of Mr. Lee's ministry in Glenarm—if he ever was minister there—I know nothing. And I am sorry to say that I am in the same state of ignorance with regard to nearly the entire period of the ministry of his successor.

VII.—James Creighton was ordained at Glenarm on May 24, 1709; as the date is given by the late Dr. Reid (in a certain law paper which I have seen) on the authority of the manuscript Minutes of the General Synod of Ulster. I have also met with Mr. Creighton's name as being minister of Glenarm in 1724, when he attended the Synod in Belfast which tried and condemned Mr. Nevin of Downpatrick for heresy. On this occasion Mr. Creighton did not join in the vote which excluded Mr. Nevin from ministerial communion with the Synod; but neither did he join in the protest against that exclusion which was signed by the future founders of the Antrim Presbytery. I may add that to this latter document was appended the name of Mr. Nehemiah Donnelson, whom it would be gratifying to be able to claim as a member of the ancient and respectable family of that name which for many years was located in Glenarm. Two years previously, viz., in 1722, Robert Mathews of Glenarm Congregation had signed "the representation of the gentlemen of the Presbyterian persuasion" in favour of peace and toleration, which at that time had been presented to the General Synod.

The foregoing is the entire amount of my very limited knowledge concerning the period of Mr. Creighton's ministry in Glenarm. Whether or not that gentleman was alive at the time of the formation of the Antrim Presbytery in 1726, or what part he took in the transactions of that period, I cannot tell. Names are scrupulously withheld in the "Narrative of the Seven General Synods."

But in none of the various lists which I have seen of the original members of that Body (some of which, however, are not very accurate), do I find the name of Mr. James Creighton, the minister of Glenarm.

VIII.—Thomas Brown (—— 1754)—is the next name on my list of the Presbyterian Ministers of Glenarm; but the same want of Presbyterial Records from 1691 to 1745, which has prevented me from being able to say much concerning the ministry of Mr. Creighton, also puts it out of my power to give any particulars respecting the earlier part of the incumbency of his successor. I cannot even mention the exact date of Mr. Brown's settlement in Glenarm, nor can I state anything with regard to his antecedents or personal history. The oldest volume extant of the Minutes of the Templepatrick Presbytery—with which body the Congregation of Glenarm was connected from the formation of that Presbytery in 1725 till its disruption in 1829—begins with August 27, 1745. On that day Mr. Thomas Brown attended the meeting of Presbytery in Templepatrick, accompanied by Mr. John Richey* as elder from Glenarm; and also officiated on that occasion as clerk of Presbytery in place of Mr. Frazer of Carrickfergus, who was the regular clerk, but who, during that year, filled the Moderator's chair. Beyond the mention of Mr. Thomas Brown's name as a member of Presbytery, no particular reference is made in the Minutes to him or his Congregation of Glenarm until we come to April 29, 1746, when an attempt was made by some of his admirers elsewhere to seduce him from his connection with the worshipping society whose history I am now writing. On the day named, Messrs. Forsythe and others attended, as Commissioners from the Congregation of Ballynure, near Larne, and presented to the Presbytery, which happened to meet that day at Ballynure, "a supplication setting forth their unanimity in their choice of the Rev. Thomas Brown of Glenarm, to

* Mr. John Richey was for many years a probationer in the Templepatrick Presbytery, but never had any congregational charge. He was a native and inhabitant of Glenarm, where he died January 12, 1748. He was of the same family with the maternal ancestors of my venerable and most intelligent friend and hearer, Mr. Alexander Richey Burke, who still has the young probationer's Bible.

be their stated pastor, and urging that some member of Presbytery might be appointed immediately to preside in a call, and to put their reasons for said transportation in form." When the Ballynure Commissioners were asked by the Presbytery what they proposed giving for the support of Mr Brown, as their minister, they answered they would give him thirty pounds sterling per annum; on which terms the call was immediately signed in the meeting-house of Ballynure, and ordered to be transmitted forthwith to Mr. Brown, together with the reasons which were alleged by Ballynure in support of his transportation from Glenarm. At the same time, another copy of these reasons was also ordered to be transmitted to the Congregation of Glenarm, who were further desired, if they saw fit, to appear at the next meeting, and plead their own cause for the retention of Mr. Brown. Accordingly at the next meeting of Presbytery, which was held at Donegore, May 20, 1746, and which was attended by Mr. John M'Collum,* as elder from Glenarm, appeared also from the same place Messrs. Hugh M'Collum and Thomas M'Cutcheon† as Commissioners, to oppose their minister's transportation to Ballynure. But on this occasion the people of Glenarm had to withstand other persons who were covetous of their minister besides those of Ballynure; for not only did that Congregation, by its Commissioners, Francis Clements‡ Esq., and Mr. John M'Comb, prosecute its call to Mr.

* The M'Collum family lived at Limnalarry, below Carnlough, where a Colonel, and a Major M'Collum achieved in succession a sort of local reputation. In 1775 Mr. Archibald M'Collum, of this family, held the Commission of the Peace for the County Antrim. About 1740, Mr. M'Collum had been set down in a rent paper connected with the Antrim estate as "worth forty pounds per annum" in fee.

† The M'Cutcheon family formerly held a small property beside Carnlough, called, from its original owners, Harp-hall (see p. 82), which comprised two or three townlands, and was of the value of about £400 a year. On the death, in the West Indies, of the last legitimate representative of the M'Cutcheon family, the property fell into the hands of a young man who was sometimes called Adam Brown M'Cutcheon, and at other times Adam M'Cutcheon Brown. By him it was soon alienated. Part is now in the hands of Mr. P. Gibbons of Cairnlough, and the remainder is owned by Mr. W. Orr, Solicitor, of Ballymena.

‡ Mr. Clements was of the same family as the Earl of Leitrim, whose ancestors originally came from Straid, near Ballynure, where they settled in 1609, and got a valuable grant of land from John Dalway, of Bellahill.

Brown; but from Island Magee, also, "appeared Messrs. Joseph M'Clelland and John Neilson, supplicating for Mr. Thomas Brown to supply them two Lord's days, and after that, another member of the Presbytery to preside in a call to him; and that all affairs relating to Mr. Thomas Brown's call from Ballynure may be stopped till next meeting. Upon this, motion was made to enquire at said Commissioners from Island Magee what they had done for paying up the suppliers, to which they answered that they were about to advance one quarter's stipend, which they expected would answer the demand of the suppliers. The Presbytery, without regarding the supplication from Island Magee, proceeded to consider the affair of the transportation. Ballynure reasons for it, and Glenarm reasons in answer to them, were read paragraph by paragraph, and the Commissioners of both sides fully heard; after which the Presbytery withdrew to the vestry, and having reasoned some time on what they had heard, the question was put, 'Transport Mr. Thomas Brown to Ballynure or not?' and it carried by a great majority *not*. Then the Presbytery returned to the meeting-house, and intimated the sentence to the parties. Those from Glenarm were very thankful to the Presbytery for the justice the Presbytery had done them; and the other party were as much offended at their disapointment."*

Shortly afterwards, viz., on October 7, 1746, the old-fashioned rule by which Presbyteries in those days tested, at frequent intervals, the continued ministerial gifts of all their members, was applied to Mr. Thomas Brown of Glenarm, who on that day was "appointed to deliver a common head before the Presbytery at next meeting, on

* If, on this occasion, Ballynure did not succeed in robbing Glenarm of its minister, it was shortly afterwards more successful in performing that office for the Congregation of Ballinderry, whose minister, Mr. Clotworthy Brown, a brother of Mr. Thomas Brown, of Glenarm, it inveigled to Ballynure after he had resided only four months with the people of Ballinderry. Mr. Clotworthy Brown, however, did not stay long in Ballynure, where indeed his ministry cannot have been agreeable, for it did not conduce to the harmony of the congregation. He soon removed to Belfast as colleague to Mr. Drennan, where he was afflicted with a paralytic affliction in his head which often compelled him literally to *hold his jaw;* for it is said that he was frequently obliged to keep his chin steady with his hand while preaching. (See *Christian Moderator*, i. 429).

the question whether Christ be the only advocate of believers at the throne of grace, and how he pleads their cause." At the same time, Mr. Brown was nominated, in conjunction with some other ministers, "to draw up a set of questions proper to be put to a minister at his ordination, and to produce them to the Presbytery." The former of these two appointments Mr. Brown, it is gratifying to find, fulfilled to the satisfaction of his brethren; for under date December 30, 1746, it is stated that "Mr. Thomas Brown preached from John xiv. 6, and was approven." At this latter meeting, Mr. T. Brown again acted as Clerk of Presbytery, in the absence of Mr. Frazer of Carrickfergus; and I may here add, that on August 14, 1750, he was formally appointed to that office, which he continued to occupy till his death a few years afterwards.

At the meeting of Presbytery on February 7, 1749, was brought before the brethren the case of certain persons living in the North end of the parish of Cairncastle who abstained from worshipping with the Presbyterian Congregation of that parish, and persisted in attending divine service at Glenarm. The particulars of this case, as connected with the history of the Cairncastle Congregation, I have already given in *The Christian Unitarian* iv. 263, 264; and therefore I need not now allude to them, further than to repeat what I have there stated, that the persons mentioned, although remonstrated with by the Presbytery, and enjoined to attend and contribute at Cairncastle, apparently made good their point, and continued to worship at Glenarm, as the descendants of some of them do in the present day.

In 1751 another attempt was made to seduce Mr. Thomas Brown from the Congregation of Glenarm. At a meeting of Presbytery in Templepatrick, on August 20, in that year, "appeared Messrs. Gilbert Kennedy, and others, as Commissioners from Drogheda, presenting a call from that congregation to Mr. Thomas Brown of Glenarm, attested by a letter from the Rev. Samuel Bruce,* and desiring it might be recommended to his

* This Rev. Samuel Bruce, who was at this time Dr. Duchal's colleague at Wood Street, in Dublin, was father of the late Dr. Bruce, and grandfather of the present Rev. W. Bruce of Belfast.

consideration, which was done, and a committee appointed to meet at Larne to receive Mr. Brown's answer." But nothing came of this movement, of which indeed I find no subsequent mention in the Minutes. Mr. Brown certainly did not leave Glenarm, for he continued there till his death, which took place November 14, 1754, under very melancholy circumstances. On that day he had been dining with the Earl of Antrim, at Glenarm Castle, and, whilst returning at night to his own house, he fell over the curtain-wall of the bridge at the entrance to the demesne, and before effectual assistance could be rendered was drowned in the Glenarm River. If any reader, on hearing of this occurrence, should be inclined to draw from it a conclusion unfavourable to Mr. Brown's character for sobriety, he may be reminded, that at the time when the accident happened the wall alluded to was dangerously low, and it is quite possible to account for Mr. Brown's having fallen over it in a dark November night, without uncharitably supposing that he had transgressed the laws of temperance whilst enjoying the hospitality of his noble entertainer.*

During the latter part of Mr. Brown's ministry at Glenarm, viz., from 1745 to 1754, the following persons, in addition to those already named, are mentioned as Elders attending meetings of Presbytery from Glenarm, viz. :—Joseph Hunter, William Richmond, William Clarke, John M'Killup,† and John Lisk.

* By the death of Mr. Brown, who, as stated in the text, was for some years Clerk of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, the Minutes of that Presbytery, from June, 1752, till August, 1753, were lost. The name of Mr. Thomas Brown of Glenarm, as well as that of his brother, Mr. Clotworthy Brown of Belfast, is also mentioned in the advertisement for the recovery of the lost Adair M.S., which appeared several times in the *Belfast News-Letter* of 1764, and is quoted by Dr. Reid in his History, ii., 410.

† Mr. M'Killup was an ancestor, by the mother's side, of Mr. Richard Davison, formerly M.P. for Belfast.

(*To be continued.*)

DIFFERENT PATHS.

I LATELY talked with one who strove
To show that all my way was dim,
And his alone the road to Heaven,—
And thus it was I answered him:

"Strike not the staff I hold, away—
You cannot give me yours, dear friend;
Up the steep hill our paths are set,
In different wise, to one sure end.

"What though with eagle glance upturned
On heights beyond our mortal ken,
You tread the broad sure stones of Faith
More firmly than do weaker men.

"To each according to his strength;
But as we leave the plains below,
Let us carve out a wider stair,
A broader pathway through the snow.

"And when upon the golden crest
We stand at last together, freed
From mists that circle round the base,
And clouds that but obscure our creed;

"We shall perceive that though our steps
Have wandered wide apart, dear friend,
No pathway can be wholly wrong
That leads unto one perfect end."

COTTAGE VISITING AND TRACT DISTRIBUTING.

IN former times there was so strongly-marked a line of demarcation between rich and poor, that either class went its own way, without much thought or care for the other. Reciprocal duties and kindly sympathies were not dreamed of as being possible between classes so widely separated by education and habit. But modern enlightenment has wrought a great change in the relative

positions of the inhabitants of castle and cottage. The former have learned to know that wealth and station have quite as many responsibilities as enjoyments, and the latter have been taught to feel that their welfare is a matter of solicitous effort and anxious thought to those whom Providence has endowed with the means of alleviating the evils attendant on poverty and want of education, whether in things temporal or spiritual. Every one must acknowledge, and be thankful for the fact, that there is a mighty spirit of benevolence abroad. Most people are glad to aid in the innumerable benevolent projects, both public and private, which every day brings forth; and of all the engines used to benefit the poor and ignorant, there seems to be none more powerful for good than the system of cottage visiting, when the visitors possess not only time, benevolence, and energy, but, what is quite as necessary, tact, common-sense, and delicacy of feeling. Every one knows the old fable of the two knights and the shield with two sides; and, like the shield, our present subject has also two sides—the one bright, smooth, and fair, calculated to remove all difficulties, and equalize, in as much as may be, the burdens and blessings of human nature,—while the reverse is only productive of impatience, contempt, and disgust on the one hand, and bitterness, resentment, and ingratitude on the other.

A lady, whose life was one act of thankfulness to God, exemplified in good-will to man, once said, that to be a successful visitor among the poor, one needed perfectly good manners, quite as much any other requisite; and I think she was very right. Poverty and privation are not always, if often, softening influences, and surely the sense of our own short-comings, with all our advantages, should make us deal gently with the faults of those who have had only trouble and difficulty for a life-long portion. In a community where men of the middle class are, as a rule, constantly engaged in business, clergymen and physicians are the only males to whom cottage visiting could be possible, and the duty therefore—for a duty it is—devolves on women, who, having smaller brains and larger hearts, narrower minds and stronger prejudices, than men, are in so far less fitted for their work.

Numbers of good well-meaning women, without many binding family ties, feel justly that there is a task for them to do, and resolve to do it, and many accomplish a vast amount of good, benefiting themselves as well as their poor and sorely burdened fellow-creatures. But quite as many, with intentions just as good, energy as great, benevolence as active, and religious feeling as strong, do more mischief than can be easily remedied; and by bigotry, intolerance, dictatorial meddling, and in fact an utter forgetfulness of the laws of politeness and discretion, raise angry and embittered feelings in the minds of the very persons they would have cheered and helped. It is woman's part to soothe and help, to bide her time for wise and gentle counsel, which, when given at the proper moment, will always be thankfully received, even should it not be followed; but a female preacher and lawgiver is a mistake, and she deserves the rebuffs she will most assuredly meet.

I once went to see a poor woman with a very large family. The day was Saturday, and seeing that the mistress of the house was up to the elbows in soap-suds, and in no placable mood, I did my errand in few words and departed, saying that I should call again in a day or two to arrange about some work I wished to have done. When I went again, some days after, the poor woman apologized for her gruff tones and uncivil manner on the previous occasion, to which I replied that she needed no excuse, her wash-tub and her quarrelsome noisy children being more than enough to warrant some failure in politeness. "You're very good, ma'am," she said, "but, to tell you the truth, there are ladies going about giving tracts, and interfering, and two of them had been in that day before you came, and they had angered me above a bit." One had told her that it was a great shame to wash on Saturday; that if she were a good manager and prudent housekeeper, her children's and husband's garments would have been washed and ironed earlier in the week, and her house set in order by Saturday forenoon. The second lady had raised the lid from a pot on the fire and smelt at the dinner of the family, adding some undervaluing observations thereupon; and then both ladies had united in a tirade on the thriftlessness of the

poor—their carelessness and incapacity—contrasting their mode of life with that of the poorer classes in England (than which few things are more irritating to a poor Irish man or woman)—and concluding by advising the woman to cultivate a grateful spirit and a better temper; for, even according to her own account, she had stoutly defended her proceedings, on the grounds that the family clothing was so scanty that she was compelled to wash it on Saturday if she meant to have her children and husband tolerably decent on Sunday. They kindly told her how she might get over that difficulty, but as the remedial measures they advocated would have involved a much greater outlay of money than the woman was ever likely to have, it may be imagined that the suggestion was not favourably received. When the thick-headed, well-meaning, mischief-making visitors left, they handed their hostess some tracts, intimating that they were to be "read with prayer," and should be called for at a certain time, "as if I had time to read tracts," said my excited complainant. "I wonder how they would like the Queen, or some lady as much above them as they are above me, to come poking her nose into their house on washing-day, and letting soot off the lid of the pot into their dinner, and finding fault with everything. If they had a husband to wash for, and him with only one shirt, they'd maybe be glad enough to wash on Saturday; but they haven't no husband, and there's where it is, they have nothing to do at home, so they go about nagging at us." And although the woman's temper was certainly not the best, and one could have wished her grammar better, it would seem as if her reasoning were not altogether defective. If we are to do good to our poor neighbours it must be by keeping our own tempers, "possessing our souls in patience," and by studying not to hurt their self-respect.

As for the tracts which are so largely distributed, will any unbiassed person take, at hazard, a bundle of them, and (if he or she can manage to read them through) judge dispassionately whether they are likely to do much good. Some few there are exceptionally good, but they are very rare. Some set cant, quasi-religious phrases, apocryphal accounts of saintly children, and men and

women reclaimed from the vilest profligacy to a high state of sanctimonious inanity, form a large proportion of those publications which are meant to be a powerful medium of conversion. Do they *ever* do *any* benefit to any one? I scarcely think it. The drivelling absurdity, the weak "religion and water," and pious fables, set forms of expression and unfamiliar language of some, and what appears to be the downright blasphemous, pert familiarity with which the most sacred names and subjects are treated in others, must,—when they are read at all,—serve rather to excite disgust and ridicule than any better feelings.

I lately read a tract, which was most expensively got up in a glazed pink wrapper, with gold lettering. The type was exquisite, large and clear, with broad margins, and altogether the style of the whole thing bespoke a *chef d'œuvre* of its kind; but the matter! One portion of it I will quote from memory, and it may serve as by no means an unfair sample of the whole. An inexperienced workwoman, employed by a West-end milliner, was sent home by her mistress with a bonnet to a lady in Hyde Park. The lady did not like the bonnet, and suggested some alterations, which, she said, must be done on the spot. So the young workwoman, sadly perplexed because of her want of skill, and the exquisite style of the bonnet, was shut up in a room, and supplied with lace and flowers and all the implements of her craft. She had not the least idea of how she was to begin to alter a structure which she had seen task to the utmost the taste and talent of the best *artistes* in the workroom. But suddenly, like a flash of light, there burst on her memory the advice she had recently had from a religious friend, viz.,—"Tell Jesus;" and she did so, and He at once inspired her with the proper method of proceeding in her task. In a very short time the fabric was completed, and the milliner felt that the bonnet was now perfect; but, lest the lady's caprice might induce her to find some fault, a second communication was made to the same high source, and the theme was—that the lady might be disposed to be satisfied with her re-modelled head-gear. The result was that she was more than pleased. Does this need any comment? We have high and holy

authority to "pray without ceasing"—to be "instant in prayer;" but I take it that our prayers are not meant to be offered up for the perfection of a frivolity of lace and flowers. In the same tract, a lady, the principal heroine of the sketch, is congratulated on having secured very pleasant sea-side lodgings; her reply was,—"*Yes, it was very kind of the Lord.*" A kind father—a just, yet merciful judge—a beneficent giver of all good things—a protector, who orders all our goings and comings, have we in truth in Him; but does it not seem to savour of irreverence to implore His aid to minister to the puerile needs of our vanity and luxury?

In another tract, purporting to be written by a clergyman, who gives his own experience of the efficacy of prayer, there is mentioned one fact—if it be a fact—which also relates to the replenishing of the wardrobe. The gentleman very much wanted a new hat, and had no money wherewith to buy one, so he says: "I mentioned to the Lord, in prayer, my desire for a hat;" and the prayer was granted, if my memory serves me right, that day or the next. There is in the style of some of those publications a flippant familiarity wholly unsuited to the sacred subjects of which they treat; and there is, moreover, a self-dissection on religious matters,—a perfect openness of discussion in the matter of "gifts and graces,"—and a half boastful, half humble assertion of spiritual superiority, which arouses at once a feeling of ridicule and one of pity. The holy, solemn words and truths of the Bible are diluted with inane twaddle, and wrapped up in silly namby-pamby stories, like medicine disguised in sugar. Luther said it was "a pity that the devil should have all the good music." It seems no less a pity that "the world, the flesh, and the devil," should have all the clever writers. Surely, if there must be tracts, the subjects of which they treat are important and impressive enough to demand that they be written by men or women able to bring the powers of lucid reasoning and apt illustration to bear on the all-important theme of salvation. As the affair now stands, it would appear that persons who can write nothing else fit to read, think themselves competent to write their religious experiences, or those of their friends. Numerous texts

of Scripture—as many sentences of the peculiar cant in favour—a liberal sprinkling of such words as "grace" and "faith"—and a large proportion of feeble anecdotes, the truth of which one is much inclined to doubt,—these form the staple of the tracts of the present day, which are eagerly bought up and disseminated by the religious public. I heartily wish them more sense and good taste.

To compare things temporal with things spiritual, what should we think of the delicacy of feeling, or the real depth of affection, in a man who went about eternally introducing, at the most inopportune times and seasons, the praises of some beloved object, using the name of the beloved on all occasions, and with the most offensive familiarity. I fancy we should be likely to condemn him as a shallow fool, whose feelings had no real depth, but expended themselves in froth and noise. And if we should judge thus of a merely human affection, how much more are we not likely to do so when the theme so flippantly dealt with is the sacred Holy of Holies,—not to be approached with profane feet, or unclean hands, or twaddling irreverent phraseology. Let "the tree be known by its fruit;" let our lives show our belief, our "grace," and our "faith;" let our charity towards all men—our hard judgment of our own faults—our indulgence for those of our neighbours, speak for the "faith that is in us;" let us pray not for bonnets and hats and pleasant sea-side lodgings, but that we may be enabled to walk aright, and not bring shame on the glorious profession of Christianity. What does *the* Word say? "Seek ye first the kingdom of Heaven, and all these things shall be added unto you." Is there not there made a direct provision for our temporal needs? Can we not trust an all-seeing, all-wise Father, to know our wants and provide for them? It seems as though the real want of faith lay with those who cannot do so, but weary Heaven with prayers for trivialities, and remember not, that if we are true servants of God, "all those things shall be added unto us."

And now, to revert for a moment to the first division of my subject, I would beg lady visitors to bear in mind, that a little human sympathy, a little timely temporal aid or advice, kindly given, as from one woman to another,

will do more to benefit their suffering, over-laden sisters, than an hour's preaching from the self-elected pedestal of religious superiority; nay, more good than a hundred weight of tracts, such as they now are, and which, let me tell them, are rarely read at all by the cottagers with whom they are left.

It is to be wished that wiser heads and abler pens than mine might treat the subject as it deserves; for a radical reform in our religious tracts is a vital necessity, as any moderately intelligent person may judge for himself, if he will but be at the pains to do so.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS.

A Sunday School Lesson.—No. 4.

We read that when our Lord was baptized by John, "immediately the Spirit drove him into the wilderness,—that he was there forty days, tempted of Satan, and was with the wild beasts,—and that angels ministered unto him." Satan means an adversary, an accuser or tempter,—any one, anything that might induce to go astray. Jesus, we are told, fasted during the whole time; and as Moses fasted forty days in the mount, when he had communications with God, there is no difficulty in believing that, miraculously supported, our Saviour did likewise. Indeed the miracle was as great in the case of Moses as of Christ. But the desert was chosen as the scene of our Saviour's temptation. He went thither immediately after coming up out of the water, strongly impelled by the divine Spirit—which is meant by the Spirit driving him—in order that he might, in deep solitude, and with no fear of interruption, meditate on the great work he had undertaken, and to which he had just been consecrated, and that he might receive, without witness from man, messages from God his Father, and be thus fully informed as to the purposes of the Gospel he was to announce to the world. The wilderness, or the desert, to which our Lord now retired, was a very secluded, a very barren, and a very melancholy spot, and the part of it to which he went was very seldom trodden by the foot of man.

High rocks are piled up around in the utmost seeming confusion, and frightful caverns are found in the sides of the mountains that surround the whole. It is said that "nothing can be more forbidding than the aspect of these hills;" but an old and very observant traveller has informed us that the view from them is delightful. The whole of the ground is hard, dry, and encumbered with stones. In after times many of the caverns were turned into grottoes—the habitations of hermits—who were regarded as very holy men, because they thus lived away from the world, wore coarse garments, ate and drank and slept very little, and spent their days and nights in repeating prayers. God requires no such observances from us; yet, no doubt such persons were sincere, and thought they were right in thus living where their Master had been tempted.

But the Lord Jesus came into the desert not to spend all his days there, but to fit himself for the ministry to which he was called. His was to be a life full of danger, yet full of activity, and it was necessary he should meditate much and long on the manner in which he was to exercise himself, so that he might glorify God's name by finishing the work given him to do. Our sublime poet has written of the thoughts that, awakened now in the Redeemer's mind, swarmed there, whilst he considered what he felt within himself,—his former life and conversation,—what he was called on to do,—and in what way it was to be accomplished,—and we have his determination as it had ever been:

> "By winning words to conquer willing hearts,
> And make persuasion do the work of fear."

And then he is represented as passing the forty days, sometimes on a hill, anon in a shady vale under a tree, or harboured in a cave among the wild beasts, who harmed him not. Here our great pattern thought and resolved—here he was tempted—and here he nobly withstood temptation; here, though he hungered, he resisted the calls of appetite, of vanity, of ambition, for he would not tempt the Lord his God.

The Lord Jesus, then, was tempted just as any of us are liable to be tempted, and his trials are warnings, also

encouragements, to us. The temptations were three in number, and of very different kinds. The first might be called the lowest, yet it was a most pressing one. He had fasted a long time—much longer than any merely human power could endure; but the miracle that had thus enabled him to live so long without food was at an end. He was very hungry, and the thought would be—how shall I satisfy my appetite for food—how stifle the calls of hunger? There was no food within his reach—there were no places near at which food could be procured,—but there were the loose stones of the desert around him. "I am the Son of God; I want bread; I have power to make bread,—why, then, not exert this power to sustain life,—why not command the stones to become food? But no, I must not use this power for any selfish purpose. I must wait my Father's will. I call to mind that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." So passed away this temptation; whilst he has taught us that there are far more important things to mind than the concerns of the body—that we must first seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and then all that is needful will be given to us.

The second of our Lord's temptations was of a subtler kind than the one now rejected. He had just received the most extraordinary powers from on high, and these powers were to be the signs of his divine commission—miracles being the proof of a prophet's coming from God; but in the course of his ministry he would often be asked for a sign from heaven that he was the Messiah. The Jews continually sought such a sign, not for any real use, but only to gratify an idle curiosity; Jesus was not thus to make them cry, lo here, or lo there, the kingdom of God was to be within them, in their hearts, purified from sin and the world. Nothing was to be done for vain show, for the mere sake of doing it, yet the temptation to display was great. Why should I not now try the powers given me? Why not, in the presence of all the people, and in the holiest part of the holy city, make a wonderful manifestation that I am the Christ the Son of the living God, and thus compel them to acknowledge me? and a text of Scripture comes opportunely to the

purpose—"He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." But no sooner does the temptation take this shape than it is made powerless by the reflection, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." It was enough. There must be no self-seeking in my miracles. I must not work them for my glory, but for the glory of my Heavenly Father. And here we perceive the meekness and lowliness of heart of the Master. All power is given to him, he uses it to honour God by doing good to those around. Blessed Jesus, for which shall we most admire thee—thy greatness or thy humility? May we imitate him by giving place to one another—by charity, which vaunteth not itself.

The third and last temptation was the most powerful of all—the most difficult to be resisted. Jesus knew that he was the Christ, the Saviour of his people, and that that people were longing for a deliverer, were continually rising against the Roman power, and no wonder; for the Roman yoke was of the most galling kind, and the Jews were mad for freedom. They had no idea of their Messiah save as a temporal conqueror and prince. Our Lord was well aware of this, and that he had but to announce himself as their leader to draw many thousands of armed men to him who would gladly own him as their captain. Before his mind's eye would pass the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, and the tempter would whisper, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." But the thought was sent away with abhorrence. "Get thee behind me Satan, it is written thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, him only shalt thou serve." He cast down all lofty imaginations, he was sent not to triumph but to suffer, not to be ministered unto but to minister, to give his life a ransom for many, that through his stripes we might be healed. It was for his obedience unto death, even the death of the cross, that God his Father highly exalted him, and his obedience, in the most painful things, ensured our salvation. So we see the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. So we learn from him how to resist temptation, whilst we also find that to be tempted is no proof of God's displea-

sure, but often the means by which he exercises his faithful servants, that thus they may be perfected, being brought through much tribulation to the kingdom of God.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIAN SOCIETY FOR THE DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

The Rev. John Cropper of Stand, Lancashire, preached the Annual Sermons in behalf of this Society in Belfast, on Sunday, May 6. In the forenoon he preached in the First Meeting-house, Rosemary Street, from John xvii. 26, "I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it;" and in the afternoon he preached in the Second Meeting-house, from John xiii. 15, "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you."

On Monday evening, May 7th, the Annual Meeting was held in the First Meeting-house, the Rev. F. M'Cammon, in the Chair. The meeting having been opened with prayer by the Rev. C. J. M'Alester; the chairman said—

Ladies and Gentlemen,—I beg to return you my best thanks for the honour you have done me in calling upon me to take the chair at your meeting this evening. I must confess, however, that it was not without considerable hesitation and misgivings that I consented to occupy this prominent position. I feel persuaded that some person of greater experience should be in my place. But I hope you will extend to me your kind indulgence for the very inefficient manner in which I fear I shall be found to discharge the duties that devolve upon me. There is one thing, however, of which I am certain, and that is, that there are few, if any, among the subscribers to the Unitarian Society who sympathise more warmly with its objects, or take a deeper interest in its prosperity than I do. This Society has now been in existence for a considerable time. It was established so long ago as the year 1831, in order, as we learn from one of its rules, "to maintain the Sufficiency of Scripture as a perfect rule of faith, to vindicate the Right of Private Judgment and Free Inquiry on religious subjects, and to promote a knowledge of the genuine doctrines of Christianity, founded on this great truth that 'there is but one God, the Father.'" No words of mine can be required to convince this meeting that these are praiseworthy objects. And it is to this Society that we are indebted for our Unitarian Depository, the usefulness of which to our Church cannot easily be too favourably spoken of. The Committee have always on sale at, I believe, cost price, our best Unitarian publications,—doctrinal, practical, devotional, expository, and historical,—as well as some works by liberal Trinitarians. Any one who will only take the trouble of running

his eye over a few of their published annual catalogues of books on sale, will find the names of most of our standard Unitarian works. And the committee keep constantly on hands a large supply of the best tracts that have been published in illustration and defence of Unitarianism—very many of which are sold, or given away for free distribution; and, though last, not least, there is always in the Depository a great variety of most useful and most interesting little story books for the young. In selecting these, much care is taken to have no books that contain any objectionable matter. There is great demand for these little works for Sunday-school premiums and other purposes. Why, ladies and gentlemen, if this Society did nothing more than provide us with our excellent Depository, it would give us full value for the comparatively small funds which it has at its disposal. My only wonder is that, with such very limited means, they can manage to do so much; and I am sure I only express the opinion of all present, when I say that it would be an unspeakable loss to our denomination and to the cause of liberal Christianity in the Province of Ulster, if, from want of funds, or for any other reason, this most useful Society should be broken up. Yet, it cannot be denied that it has never been supported as it has deserved by the large majority of our Congregations. The simple and discreditable fact is, that, at the present time, not more than one out of every six of our country congregations contributes anything, though, I admit, a much larger proportion of them avail themselves of the advantages of the Depository. How are we to account for this? I am convinced that, if the matter were only brought before them, and the strong claims of the Society to their support plainly stated, many of the congregations that now give nothing would cheerfully contribute. I think our ministers have a false delicacy about bringing the claims of this Society before their people. I believe that, if the committee could arrange to have annual collections taken up in those places that approve of our principles and objects, and patronise this Society, a considerable addition would be made to their finances. I could easily name, I am sure, half a-dozen of congregations that are now *strict non-subscribers*, in this bad, objectionable sense of that term, that would, if appealed to, most willingly abandon their evil ways, and become *regular and exemplary subscribers*. The matter only requires to be brought before them, and the "sinews of war" would be forthcoming. We all know, from experience, that few people think of giving money to any Society unless *asked* for it. Even Belfast, though it now raises by its annual subscriptions, and by collections at sermons in the First and Second Houses, some four times the amount of the entire country contributions, would not, I fear, do nearly so much—at least in the way of *annual subscriptions*—were it not for the praiseworthy and indefatigable exertions of our zealous friend, Mr. Lenox Drennan. If we only had men like him in our country congregations, our worthy Treasurer would be able to render a far more satisfactory annual account to us than he now has it in his power to do. If the committee had sufficient funds at their disposal, they might even go the length of having a missionary to conduct occasional services in localities favourable for the dissemination of our prin-

ciples. Unquestionably, considering the wealth and the numbers of our Church, we ought to do more than we have heretofore done to place our views before the public. We believe that we have the purest and most Scriptural faith in Christendom—surely we ought to exert ourselves to spread it. Our apathy in this respect is most discreditable to us. Differing as we do from all other churches by which we are surrounded, in having no publicly recognised interpretation of Scripture embodying our views, to put into the hands of inquiring minds; rejecting as we do the authority of all human Creeds and Confessions of Faith, and taking the Scriptures as our only guide and authority in religious matters; and much misunderstood and misrepresented as we are by our fellow-Christians of other denominations, we ought, undoubtedly, to use every means in our power to proclaim our principles to the world. With the exception of our Church, was there ever known a sect who believed that they had the highest form of Christian truth, and yet did so little to disseminate their principles? No one can deny that, for some time, there has been a very strong re-action in these countries among the creed-bound party towards our free, Non-Subscribing position. What extraordinary changes in the direction of religious liberty, and in the removal of religious tests, have taken place since the formation of this Society, thirty-five years ago! If we turn towards Scotland, we shall find that the law which, until a recent period, required all lay professors in her Universities to subscribe the Westminster Confession of Faith, has been abolished. Subscription to religious tests has been greatly relaxed, and, doubtless, will eventually be altogether done away with in the old exclusive Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In our own Dublin Trinity College also there have been some important changes made in the same direction. And we all know that the London University, and our Irish Queen's Colleges and Queen's University, have all been established on the broadest principles of religious liberty—there being a total absence of subscription to any religious tests whatever. And this spirit of hostility to human creeds is also extending itself to the popular churches of these countries and of America. Several of the foremost men in creed-bound churches have lately been raising their voices, or using their pens, against subscription to human creeds. Why, it was only the other day that Professor Tulloch, in his opening address to the students of a Scotch University, fearlessly told them that "the popular ecclesiastical notion of creeds and confessions, as in some sense absolute expression of Christian truth . . . . . is a notion in the face of all theological science, which every theological student deserving the name has long since abandoned." It certainly required no little courage to make such a statement to a class of theological students in creed-bound Scotland, where every minister, both in the Established and Free Churches, is obliged to sign the Westminster Confession of Faith. And we cannot but anticipate the best results when these young men, imbued with such principles, come to fill the pulpits of Scotland. We can hardly expect them, after listening to such teaching, tamely to acquiesce in the perpetuation of absolute, unqualified subscription to the Confession. And many of you doubt-

less remember the celebrated letter of that distinguished divine, Dr. Stanley, Dean of Westminster, which he addressed some time ago to the Bishop of London, against subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Church of England Prayer Book,—a letter which broadly states that "it is impossible that any number of educated men could subscribe to the Articles without considerable reservation,"—and that "if once we press these subscriptions [to the Prayer Book and Articles] in their rigid and literal sense . . . . . *there is not one clergyman in the Church who can venture to cast a stone at another,—they must all go out, from the greatest to the least,—from the Archbishop in his palace in Lambeth to the humblest Curate in the wilds of Cumberland.*" This is, indeed, a very sad account of the state of things in the Church of England at the time when this remarkable letter was written. And if it would not be trespassing unreasonably on your time, I should like to mention to you what the talented, eloquent, and popular American divine, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, says against subscription to Creeds. His words are,—"There is nothing imaginary in the statement that the *Creed power is beginning to prohibit the Bible as really as Rome did*, though in a subtler way. During the whole course of seven years' study the Protestant candidate for the ministry *sees before him an unauthorised statement spiked down and stereotyped, of what he must find in the Bible, or be martyred.* . . . . . Hence, I say, that the *liberty of opinion* in our theological seminaries is a *mere form.* . . . . . *The whole boasted liberty of the student consists in a choice of chains*,—a choice of handcuffs—whether he will wear the Presbyterian handcuffs, Baptist, Methodist, Episcopal, or other Evangelical handcuffs. Hence, it has now come to pass, that the *ministry themselves dare not study the Bible.* . . . . . *If they do study and search, they cannot shew the people what they find there.*" Ought not such powerful testimonies as these against Creeds and Confessions to encourage us to persist in raising our voices against their authority; to persevere in our efforts to vindicate the Christian's right to go directly to the Scriptures themselves for information on all religious subjects—to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made all his disciples free? I believe our Church is the only one in this country which fully and practically carries out the great Protestant principles, the Sufficiency of Scripture, and the Right of Private Judgment. We go to the fountain-head to drink the pure waters of life for ourselves. And *so highly do we reverence the Scriptures that we refuse to believe any doctrine which cannot be stated in the very words of Holy Writ.* I think, therefore, that our Church is entitled to be considered the true Evangelical Alliance. And if we could succeed in inducing the Christian world to take the Scriptures as their sole rule of faith, and to give up human Creeds and Articles,—to refuse to allow any man or Synod or Council to come between them and the Sacred Volume, the triumph of our opinions would be certain—would be unavoidable. We know, as a historical fact, that nearly all our old Congregations in this country and in England were at one time Trinitarian. But there was nothing in their trust deeds requiring any particular doctrines to be taught from the pulpits,—the worshippers were left free to read and interpret the Scriptures for

themselves, and the natural result was that they became Unitarians. This Society, therefore, has every encouragement to persevere in the good work in which it has for so many years been engaged. Our views are undeniably spreading among the educated classes, especially in England and America. In fact, our English Unitarian pulpits are at this present time very largely supplied by ministers who are converts from Trinitarianism. I could myself give you the names of upwards of twenty such converts. Why, in London alone, five of our most eminent ministers,—men who would be an honour to any Church,—were for years Trinitarian clergymen. There is not, I am certain, in these countries, any other Church, which, in proportion to its numbers, could boast of so many converts among its ministers as ours can. Before calling upon the Secretary to read the Society's report for the past year, perhaps you will permit me to mention one other very remarkable fact in connexion with English Unitarianism,—a fact which I am sure all present will be delighted to hear. I copied the statement myself from *The Unitarian Herald*. At a meeting of the Liverpool District Missionary Society, held a year or two ago, it was publicly announced, that out of thirty lay preachers in connexion with our denomination in England, no less than twenty three were converts from Trinitarianism. I must apologise for trespassing so long upon the time of the meeting. I beg to thank you for the attention with which you have listened to me.

The Rev. C. J. M'Allester, Secretary of the Society then read the Report of the Committee, from which the following are extracts:—

"In the course of the year donations of tracts have been made to the Rev. F. R. Young, Swindon, Wiltshire; the Rev. J. A. Crozier, Newry; the Rev. H. Moore, Newtownards, and others.

"Your Secretary visited Girvan in June last, and officiated on the Sunday, visiting the several members of the Church on the Saturday and Monday. The congregation has suffered from the want of regular religious services, and it is much to be regretted that there is no prospect at present of matters being improved. There are several intelligent and earnest men connected with the Church, and if they could be induced to conduct a weekly service, the small and neat chapel, which was erected at the cost of so much toil and anxiety, might still be made available to keep alive in Girvan the cause of Christian Unitarianism. Mr. Peter Callender preached in Girvan on a Sunday in September, at the request of your committee: his report of matters in the congregation is much the same as that which your Secretary gave. We should add, that the ministers who go to Girvan from your society are always welcomed, and their services gratefully received, and we therefore recommend that a minister should be sent over from time to time as opportunity may offer. When your Secretary was in Scotland he preached on a week-day evening in the Paisley Unitarian Chapel, which is an upper room commodiously fitted up, and the life and zeal manifested by the brethren there were particularly gratifying.

"Although *The Christian Unitarian* is not published at the expense of the society, it is issued under the sanction of your com-

mittee, and sold in your depository, and it is therefore right that it should be noticed in the annual report. It is cheering to know that it continues to have a considerable circulation, and in the past year it has been more largely sold in England. It has the distinction of being one of the few periodicals of the denomination in the Three Kingdoms which contend for the Divine authority of Revelation as an essential article of the Christian faith, and is therefore acceptable to some whose religious principles are justly offended by the latitudinarian views which have lately taken the Unitarian name.

"At your last annual meeting, in compliance with an invitation received from the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Society, your esteemed and venerable Treasurer was appointed as a representative to attend the annual meeting of that body, and he accordingly represented this society on that occasion.

"In the course of the year your society has sustained a serious loss in the death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, of Dunmurry, who, more than thirty-five years ago, took an active part in its organisation, and who continued to be, till the time of his death, one of its warmest and ablest supporters: by his great abilities and commanding eloquence, he did much to uphold and extend those principles of Unitarian Christianity and religious freedom which it is the object of your society to promote. While, however, we feel the cause which we espouse to be true and holy, no losses, however great, should dishearten us; and though the ablest in our ranks are taken away, their removal should only fill us with increasing zeal and ardour, and move us to redoubled efforts for the promotion of views which we believe eminently calculated to promote the glory of God, and the peace and happiness of man."

M. Andrews Esq., Treasurer, then read the Statement of Accounts, which showed a balance in favour of the Society of £77 19s. 5d.

The Rev. T. H. M. Scott moved that the Report which had just been read, and the Accounts which had been submitted, be received. Mr. Scott thanked the Society for having selected a man so young and comparatively unknown as himself, to make this motion. In two ways, however, he found himself associated with the Report, which offered him some reason for moving its adoption. The Society had, in their Report, alluded to the tracts printed by them and kept in their Depository. On different occasions he (Mr. S.) had been favoured by the Society with donations of these tracts, for the purpose of distribution, and he had now to state, that from these little papers he had received the most efficient aid. During his residence in England he had circulated tracts very widely, which had been sent him by this Society, and he could scarcely over-estimate the assistance they had given him. He was now glad to have a public opportunity of thanking the Society for the present of these tracts. In addition to this reference in the Report, he observed an allusion to the late venerable Pastor of Dunmurry, Doctor Montgomery. That allusion contained a just, and only a just tribute, to the memory of that great and good man. Doctor Montgomery's services to Unitarianism, and his distinguished public career, made him (Mr. S.) proud to be the successor to one so

eminent and esteemed. In his childhood he had been accustomed to respect the name of Doctor Montgomery, and when after years brought him to the enjoyment of a personal intimacy with the possessor of that name, respect ripened into reverence and deepened into love. Doctor Montgomery's memory would ever be cherished in his heart. Mr. Scott added that he felt greatly pleased with the Report of the Committee, and, on all these grounds, he felt much pleasure in proposing to the meeting—"That the Report of the Committee and the Treasurer's Accounts, as now submitted, be received, and that they be printed, together with the Rules of the Society, the list of its Officers, the Catalogue of Books and Tracts on sale at the Depository, the list of subscribers, and the proceedings of the present meeting."

The Rev. T. Bowring seconded the motion, which, having been put from the chair, was passed unanimously.

Mr. William Spackman moved—"That, while we learn from the Sacred Scriptures that the Father is the only True God, and that the Lord Jesus is His well-beloved Son, sent by Him to instruct and save the world, we feel it a high privilege to hold these rational, holy, and consolatory truths, and we regard it as our bounden duty to labour according to our abilities to uphold and spread them among our fellow-men." He did not think it creditable in any way that the large number of respectable and influential persons who composed the Unitarian body in Belfast should allow a meeting to take place with such a representation as they had that night. They should do not only twice or thrice but even ten times as much as they were doing. Their Church, he believed, was the only one that could express its doctrines in the language of Scripture without note or comment, and they should not hide their light under a bushel, but labour earnestly to disseminate their principles.

Mr. N. Oakman seconded the resolution, which was passed.

Mr. A. O'D. Taylor proposed the next resolution—"That we desire to express our warm and hearty thanks to the Rev. John Cropper, M.A., for his kindness in consenting to preach the anniversary sermons of the Unitarian Society on this occasion; and for the able, impressive, and Christian discourses delivered by him yesterday on its behalf in the Churches of the First and Second Presbyterian Congregations." Mr. Taylor spoke in high terms of the discourse delivered by Mr. Cropper in that Church, the chief characteristic of which, he said, was an expression of their belief in the beautiful doctrine of one God, the Father, and in the Divine mission of Jesus Christ. For the views he had expressed, so thoroughly Christian and Unitarian, he felt they were under a very deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Cropper.

Mr. L. Drennan seconded the resolution.

Rev. J. S. Porter supported the resolution. He said he had often heard the cause of Unitarianism advocated at meetings of the Society, and on different occasions he had borne his testimony to the zeal, ability, and eloquence of the gifted men whom the Committee had invited for the purpose of advocating the cause of that Society, but he would say that he had never been more impressed than by the manly, candid, open statement of doctrine, as well as

the rational argument with which it was enforced, and the truly Christian and theological spirit which pervaded every sentence, in the discourse which he had heard on the previous day.

The resolution was then put and passed by acclamation.

Rev. Mr. CROPPER returned thanks. With regard to the services he had performed on the previous day, he entered on them with his whole heart and soul. With regard to himself he had openly to declare his firm belief in the unity of God and in the Divine mission of Jesus Christ. He recognised, in Jesus Christ, the Son of God to the full letter of the New Testament, and, if he were called upon to ignore that principle of his faith, he would no longer occupy a religious pulpit, and would no longer call himself a Christian minister. With regard to Unitarians in England, he would say on their behalf, he believed it was but a small section of them who held extreme opinions. Mr. Cropper then referred to some incidents of his ministerial life, where he came in contact with persons of other denominations, by which he had been more fully confirmed in his belief as a Christian Unitarian. He then stated that, if people only knew what their doctrines were, a great many would be found in the world who could not disagree with, or object to them.

Rev. J. S. PORTER then rose to move the next resolution. He said that he rose to pay a debt of respect and gratitude to the memory of one who had been mentioned in their report—he alluded to the late Rev. Dr. Montgomery. If he were speaking in any distant place it might be necessary to dwell upon his high talents and his services to the cause on behalf of which they were assembled; but, speaking in Belfast, where he long resided and where all his acts were well known, it would be a useless occupation of their time to dwell upon the subject at any length. Almost from the moment Dr. Montgomery became a Presbyterian minister he was recognised as the chief of the supporters of the liberal party in the General Synod of Ulster. At the meeting of Synod in Strabane, in 1827, he was put forward as the champion of the cause of civil and religious liberty which was then assailed, and, as far as a vote would carry, was lost; but the cause was not lost, for that speech was the means, under Divine Providence, of extending far and wide the knowledge of those principles which he then maintained, and which were the same he advocated in that Society. From that time he took the first place among the advocates of religious liberty in the North of Ireland. He was also a strong advocate of Catholic Emancipation. He stood beside the late Dr. Crolly, Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, upon the steps of the altar in the principal Roman Catholic Chapel of this town, and delivered a speech, of which Dr. Crolly said, with justice, that it was useless for the Catholic Association to send out missionaries throughout England for the purpose of dissipating the prejudices entertained on the question, when they had such a man as Dr. Montgomery, able to express, as they then heard, the sentiments that were to be advocated on the subject. He was the friend of the down-trodden and oppressed. He stood forward on behalf of the first Reform Bill, and also, on behalf of what he looked upon as the rights of the tenant-farmers of this country, and on all

these occasions his services were of the very highest description, and entitled him to the gratitude of those whose cause he advocated. He was one of the earliest members of that Society, and when he preached a sermon on its behalf obtained the largest collection (£75) ever raised in aid of its funds. He rendered eminent service to their Congregations by enlisting the sympathies of Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, and others on behalf of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. Mr. Porter concluded by moving,—"That, on this the first occasion of our meeting since the lamented death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, we feel ourselves called upon to place on record our deep sense of the loss which this Society has sustained in the removal of one who was, from the first moment of its formation, the able and uncompromising advocate of its principles; who was, throughout a long and conspicuous public life, the strenuous, effective, and consistent champion of civil and religious liberty; and whose talents and virtues endeared him in no ordinary degree to those who were acquainted with his character and worth."

Mr. M. ANDREWS seconded the resolution, which was passed.

A Committee for the ensuing year was then chosen by ballot. On the motion of the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, seconded by the Rev. J. S. Porter, thanks were passed to the Chairman for his efficiency in the chair, and the proceedings terminated with the singing of the dismission hymn, and the benediction.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The forty-first Annual Meeting of this Association was held at the Unitarian Church, Hackney, on Wednesday, May 23rd. The attendance, which was very large, included a great number of ministers from all parts of the kingdom. The religious services were conducted by the Rev. C. C. Coe of Leicester; and the Rev. C. Wicksteed of Liverpool preached from Eph. iv. 1—6. At the close of the sermon a collection was made which amounted to £55.

The business meeting was afterwards held, Jerom Murch, Esq., J.P., Bath, the President of the Association, occupying the chair. The Rev. R. B. Aspland, Secretary, read extracts from the Annual Report, which referred to the state of Unitarianism in Transylvania and other parts of the Continent, to the Missionary operations in England during the past year, to aid afforded towards benefiting the coloured Freedmen in the United States of America, and, finally, to the important questions which had lately been raised by a notice of motion on the part of the Rev. S. Bache, that the term "Unitarian Christianity" should be more distinctly defined, and by a proposition made by some members of the Association to strike out of the rules all that relates to the alliance of Congregations with the Association. The Treasurer's Report was read by Mr. Alderman Lawrence. Resolutions were then moved and carried, adopting the report, expressing sympathy with the Protestant Ministers in France who had laboured and suffered in behalf of freedom and Christian truth, and also deep interest in the Unitarian Churches of Transylvania, conveying the thanks of the Association to the Rev. C. C. Coe and

the Rev. C. Wicksteed for their services, and appointing officers for the ensuing year. The Rev. S. Bache then rose and in a lengthened and earnest speech moved the resolution of which he had given notice, to the effect that Unitarian Christianity included the recognition of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as the only God and the only proper object of religious worship, and also the recognition of the special Divine mission and authority, as a religious teacher, of Jesus Christ himself. The Rev. T. Madge seconded the motion, which was also supported by Mr. James Yates. Sir John Bowring moved "the previous question."—The meaning of which, we presume, was, that the term "Unitarian Christianity" was distinct enough, and did not require to be more minutely defined. This amendment was seconded by the Rev. T. L. Marshall, and was supported by the Rev. R. B. Aspland, who, in doing so, signified his sympathy with Mr. Bache and Mr. Madge in their principles, and his desire to unite with them in the public advocacy of them; but as a member of the Association he could not support Mr. Bache's motion. The amendment was then put from the chair and carried by a large majority,

The Rev. J. J. Tayler then rose to move the following resolution—"That having regard to the constitution and history of the Presbyterian and other Non-Subscribing Congregations, a Committee be appointed to consider how far the British and Foreign Unitarian Association can be modified, so as more completely to meet the wants and acquire the confidence of all liberal Christian Churches, or to suggest a division of work between two agencies that should co-exist in friendly relations to each other, and to prepare a report embodying the results of their inquiries, to be submitted to a general meeting of the members of the Association." As we stated in the last number of *The Christian Unitarian*, this resolution was to have been seconded by the Secretary of the Association and to have been put forward as the joint resolution of the Committee of the Association, and Mr. Tayler's supporters, but some misunderstanding had in the mean time arisen, the Committee believing that Mr. Tayler's party had broken through the arrangement agreed on, and the resolution was seconded by T. Avison, Esq., of Liverpool. The Rev. R. B. Aspland explained the grounds of disagreement between the Committee and the supporters of the Nottingham proposition, and Mr Alderman Lawrence moved the "previous question." This was seconded by Mr. Yates, but after the Revs. E. Kell, W. James, J. Martineau, and C. Beard, and Mr. Field had spoken, the original motion was carried. An attempt was then made to form a Committee of twenty-four, and after a considerable time had been spent in an endeavour to reconcile differences, and earnest but ineffectual appeals made to Mr. Aspland and his friends to act, it was eventually agreed that Mr. Aspland should have the nomination of twelve of the Committee, and Mr. Tayler the nomination of twelve. The President elect, James Heywood, Esq., was then moved to the chair, and thanks were voted to the President for his able and impartial conduct in the chair.

We hope to give, in the next number of *The Christian Unitarian*, a condensed report of the several speeches, and a review of the proceedings at this important meeting.

The annual collation took place on Thursday, May 24, in the large dining-room of the Crystal Palace, J. Murch, Esq., in the chair. About 400 ladies and gentlemen were present. Among the toasts given were "Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over," "The House of Commons," "The British and Foreign Unitarian Association," "Our Brethren the Free Protestants of France," "Manchester New College," "Our Laymen and Ministers, may they join hand and heart in every Christian work," "The Health of the Rev. S. Bache," which were responded to by the Rev. C. Beard, J. Heywood, Esq., Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. J. Martineau, Mr. Alderman J. C. Lawrence, and the Rev. S. Bache.

OBITUARY.

Death of Dr. Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Western Virginia.—Dr. Alexander Campbell, Principal of Bethany College, Western Virginia, and founder of the denomination sometimes called after his name "Campbellites," but more frequently "Disciples," died at his residence in Bethany, in March last, in the 80th year of his age. The career of this distinguished divine may be interesting to the readers of *The Christian Unitarian*, not only from the circumstance of his being a native of the North of Ireland, but also from the liberal principles which he held, and the Scriptural views on which he organized the denomination which bears his name. We have been unable to procure any authentic information in this country respecting Dr. Campbell's early history, but the American papers which have noticed his death inform us that he was a native of County Antrim, and that his father was for some years Presbyterian minister of Richhill, County Armagh, and emigrated to the United States of America about the year 1807. Two years after, probably when he had completed his education for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in Glasgow College, his son Alexander followed, accompanied by his mother and his younger brothers and sisters. It seems that both the father and son were settled in the United States as Presbyterian ministers, Alexander being first placed in Pennsylvania, and soon after removing to Bethany, which was then a new settlement in that part of Western Virginia known as the "Pan Handle." Here he continued to reside till the time of his death,—more than half a century. Possessed of a vigorous and well-trained mind, great energy of character, and remarkable fluency and power of speech, he rapidly rose into popularity, and his preaching attracted large crowds. He soon became dissatisfied with the narrow principles of the American Presbyterian Church, and embraced, in a more thorough and consistent sense than his Presbyterian brethren held it, the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and duty. He cherished an ardent desire for union among Protestants, and argued that "Christian union can result from nothing short of the destruction of creeds and confessions of faith, inasmuch as human creeds and confessions have destroyed Christian union." He

maintained that "nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the Church, or ought to be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament; nor ought anything to be admitted as of divine obligation in the Church constitution or management, save what is enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles upon the New Testament Church, either in express terms or by approved precedent." On these principles Mr. Campbell took his stand, and the consequence was that, after having been arraigned as a "setter forth of strange doctrines," and the would-be founder of a new sect,—accusations which he repelled by saying that there was nothing new in Christianity,—he separated from the Presbyterian communion, and came before the public in defence of his views and in vindication of his orthodoxy. He contended for adult baptism by immersion as the practice of the Primitive Church. He soon became the recognised head of a new religious sect, familiarly known as the Campbellite denomination, but called by himself and the members of his Church "The Disciples." For the promulgation of his views he commenced, in 1823, the publication of *The Christian Baptist*, a monthly journal which, after some years, was succeeded by *The Millennial Harbinger*, a periodical which he continued to conduct till the period of his death. In 1840 he founded a College at Bethany, of which he was President during the remainder of his life, and to which he devoted a large share of his time, energy, and talents. Dr. Campbell was a voluminous writer; of his works, those most widely circulated are the "Christian System," his Treatise on Baptism, and his Translation of the New Testament. In religious controversy, whether oral or written, he was most at home, and his abilities were most conspicuous. Besides his innumerable discussions on theological questions, with writers of every variety of opinion, carried on for more than forty years in the pages of *The Christian Baptist* and *The Millennial Harbinger*, he held, at various times, formal public debates with distinguished adversaries, which always attracted large audiences and excited much interest. Among the most memorable of these were his discussions at Cincinnati, in 1828, with Robert Owen, the Socialist, on the Truth of the Christian Religion; with Archbishop Purcell, in 1836, on the Doctrines of the Church of Rome; and with the Rev. N. L. Rice, a Presbyterian minister, in 1843, on the subject of Christian Baptism. The last of these was held at Lexington, Kentucky; it continued for eighteen days, and attracted a large crowd of attentive hearers. On all these occasions Dr. Campbell's reputation as a scholar and theologian, his great coolness and entire self-possession, his imposing person, and his deep sonorous voice, gave him immense advantages. It would be interesting to know whether his early education, and the influences by which he was surrounded in his youth, helped to sow the seeds of liberal thought, which were developed and matured in the land of his adoption, for in many parts of Ulster, at that period, there was a decided anti-creed feeling, and it is possible that he had imbibed in childhood the principles which gave character and distinction to his after life. We do not learn, from any of the American papers we have seen, whether Dr. Campbell, in rejecting all creeds, and making the Scriptures his

sole rule of Faith, gradually abandoned the Calvinistic and Trinitarian theories; but in an elaborate volume on American Geography and Statistics, published in 1852, by Dr. Richard S. Fisher, the Campbellites are arranged, on the authority of Dr. F. A. Farley, among the Anti-Trinitarian Denominations, and if this be so, it is another striking illustration of the fact, that when the Scriptures are made the only rule of faith, the tendency uniformly is to Unitarianism.

We may here mention, as illustrating the liberality of his opinions, that when he was in Ireland, in 1840, a gentleman who had been married to a relative of the Doctor went to visit him. The mother-in-law of the gentleman was present, and lamented to him that her son-in-law was a Unitarian, when the Doctor replied—"My dear madam, I do not think the worse of him for that."

The papers from which we have condensed this sketch of the principles and labours of Dr. Campbell, represent his end as peace. Death had no power to dim his great mind. "His gentleness and patience amid his sufferings," writes a near relative, "breaks all our hearts." Such sweetness and submission to the slightest wish of those around him, such kind consideration for every one who comes into his presence—his little expressions of greeting, and his enquiring after the welfare of those who come to see him,—and such putting away of personal complaint, moves every beholder to tears. An evening or two before his death, the last rays of the departing sun were streaming through the windows directly in front of his bed, and fell upon it. A group of friends sat around him in silence, and he, turning from them to the sinking sun, uttered that passage from Malachi which had been so often on his lips during his life—"Unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings."—beautiful and touching evidence of the faith and hope which sustained the dying patriarch.

The denomination of which Dr. Campbell was the founder is now very numerous, amounting, it is said, to nearly half a million. From a statistical table in the work to which we have already referred, we learn that in 1847, they had 1800 Churches, 1000 ordained ministers, and 160,000 communicants. They reject all human creeds, and take the Bible alone as a perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, esteeming all commandments and traditions of men as necessarily fallible, and in derogation of the all-sufficiency, as well as the express injunctions of the Word of God. They partake of the Lord's Supper every Sunday, and practise Baptism by immersion. They are very numerous in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

Died, on May 14th, at Forthill, near Banbridge, Isabella, relict of the late Rev. James Davis, of Banbridge, aged 83 years.

Died, on May 25th, at Queenstown, Ellen, wife of David M'Clement, Esq., formerly of Donegall Street, Belfast.

Died, on May 26th, at Newtownards, Susan, wife of Mr. David Kennedy, aged 80 years.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

Vol. V.] JULY, 1866. [No. 6.

EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS.

All who have given their attention to the study of words—a subject which is full of varied and important interest—have been struck with the change of meaning to which, through time and circumstance, they are liable. Our authorized translation of the Scriptures affords many illustrations of such change. A single example will be sufficient. "Conversation," at the time when that translation was made, signified "behaviour;" and such texts as, "Let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ," have thus a breadth and comprehension of meaning much greater than an ordinary reader in our day would attach to them. How or why the meaning of this word "conversation" became, in the course of time, so narrowed, we have no means of ascertaining: there is certainly nothing in the etymology of the word which could justify the limitation to mere "speaking," which modern usage has imposed on it. Many such instances might be given of words and phrases having gradually degenerated from the meaning which originally and properly belonged to them, and having come to express very different ideas. Of such gratuitous and unaccountable change there is no more remarkable illustration than that which is exhibited in the phrase which we have written at the head of this paper—"*Evangelical Christians.*" "Evangelical," as most of our readers are aware, is simply an adjective formed in the ordinary way from the noun "Evangele"—which is just another word for "Gospel;" and, therefore, "Evangelical" properly signifies "belonging to or according to the Gospels." What other kind of Christians, we may ask, can there be but Evangelical Christians? True; there are other sources

of information respecting our holy faith, besides the Four Gospels. There are the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of Paul and others, from which we gain much additional information respecting our religion: but the grand truths and duties, warnings and promises, which constitute the Christian faith, are most fully embodied, and most distinctly exhibited in the Gospels, so that Bible Societies, unable to circulate largely, in many foreign tongues, the whole of the Scriptures, very wisely send the Gospels, and believe that in doing so they present to heathens the "sum and substance" of the religion of Christ. And if we were, in our own day, seeking any written foundation for the church, if we were looking for anything more on which to rest, than the simple primitive belief in Jesus as the Christ of God, we should not imitate our Protestant forefathers in making "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," our rule of faith—a rule which it must sorely puzzle some of our independent thinkers, our "absolute liberty" men, to hold by;—but we should make the Four Gospels our rule, and thus really entitle our Church to the honourable, but much abused and perverted title of *Evangelical.*

By the etymology and the original application of the word "Evangelical," it denotes, as we have said, "according to the Gospels;" and therefore an Evangelical Christian, in doctrine, is one who holds the opinions respecting God and Christ and duty, which are taught and enforced in the Four Gospels. We do not believe that in drawing his religious views from these Sacred Records, the serious and devout inquirer will find himself holding opinions at variance with those which are taught in the several Epistles; while, at the same time, the plain teachings of the Evangelists will materially assist in the study of the Epistolary writings, which contain some things "hard to be understood."

But the term has latterly assumed a very different meaning. In violation of etymology and common sense, it has been wantonly appropriated by a class of Christians who have the smallest claim to assume it—a class whose peculiar opinions and characteristic spirit are most directly at variance with its plainest teachings. This class we cannot designate by any of the ordinary terms which

denote the various sections into which Christendom is divided and sub-divided, as Protestant, Presbyterian, Baptist, or Independent; but from these various sects it claims its members; from all these, and out of all, it seeks to form what may be called an "Evangelical Alliance" — not *the* Evangelical Alliance, which has only partially united them; but an Association which, while they severally retain their peculiar views of baptism, church government, and other matters, acknowledge a kind of Freemasonry, mutually admit their claim to salvation, which they agree in denying to all others; and unite not only in the dissemination of the views which they hold in common, but also in works of charity, as feeding the hungry, and clothing the naked, from which they religiously exclude their fellow-Protestants, and all Catholics and unbelievers.

The leading points of belief which distinguish these "Evangelical Christians" may be easily expressed. Foremost among them is the Trinity—a doctrine which for many centuries was held by almost all Christians, and around which, at the present day, cluster the most devout feelings of so many earnest and faithful disciples. Arguments in its support have been drawn from many sources; and pious students of Scripture and of nature have heard it in the sublime words of Jehovah, "Let *us* make man in our own image," and have seen it in the simple shamrock that enriches our pastures: but if we seek for it in the Gospels, it is no where to be found. We do not doubt the sincerity, we do not presume to condemn the faith, of our Trinitarian brethren; we acknowledge their piety and worth, and we commend their labours of love; but we cannot call them "Evangelical," for next to the argument of common sense, the strongest that has been brought against this doctrine is, that nowhere in the Four Gospels is it stated or hinted at. The baptismal formula, as it has been often called (Matt. xxviii. 19), simply implies a belief in "the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit," which, we presume, no Christian doubts. Another essential article in the creed of "Evangelical" Christians is that of the Deity of Christ. To this, too, all Catholics and the majority of Protestants give most hearty and unwavering assent: it is, indeed, a

part of the former article, and texts of Scripture in apparently formidable array have been marshalled to support it; but, whatever other parts of Scripture may *seem* to teach, we believe that no intelligent peruser of the Gospels, uninitiated in theological mysteries, would ever draw such a doctrine from them: so little is there *Evangelical* in it.

Original sin is another of the "cardinal" points with our "Evangelical Christians;" but where it is found in the Gospels we are quite puzzled to conceive. We are not sure that our Lord once mentions Adam, or refers to his fall. On one occasion, indeed, it is said, "Thou art altogether born in sin;" but if we remember who uttered these words, and to whom they were applied, we shall be slow to adduce them as any evidence of original sin—a doctrine of which there is no trace in the Gospels, and which is therefore anything but *Evangelical*.

One other doctrine we should particularize as holding a prominent place in the creed of "Evangelical" Christians: it is the vicarious Atonement—we say, vicarious—for the Atonement, as exhibited in the Scriptures, all Christians gratefully admit. Apostles, reared in the Jewish faith, naturally employ figures borrowed from the Mosaic ritual to illustrate religious sentiments and truths; but, whatever readers of the New Testament may think they see in the Epistles, there is certainly no trace of such a doctrine in the Gospels. Several of the sacred writers refer to the purifying and cleansing influence of Christ's blood, and our "Evangelical" Christians, understanding by the term simply the material blood shed on Calvary, ascribe to it an efficacy which only the spiritual truth applied to the soul can possess: but certainly those who hold this doctrine of Atonement through the material blood of Jesus Christ can find no support for it in the writings of the Four Evangelists.

We cannot say that "Evangelical" Christians are entirely agreed on the comparative value of faith and works; for, while the disciples of Calvin would regard works as but "filthy rags," the followers of John Wesley, who, by a stretch of liberality, are classed among the "Evangelicals," hold a juster estimate of their value. Still less can we say that they all accept the doctrine of

the assurance of faith, to which some of them attach so much importance, and which, by stringent means, they seek to uphold in their own ecclesiastical courts. Enough, however, has been said to exhibit the remarkable incongruity between the name and the belief of this large class of Christians. We are not blind to their worth; we acknowledge their piety, their virtue, their zeal, though it is not always according to knowledge; but, if their opinions are to be tried by the Four Gospels, they cannot be justified: whatever else they may be, they certainly are not Evangelical. "Evangelical Christians"—the happiest name by which the humble, earnest, consistent follower of Christ could now be designated. Alexander Campbell, when he thought to escape from the error of sects and confessions, assumed for himself and his friends the name of "Disciples:" it was too vague, and already is being gradually dropped. Some, actuated by the same laudable desire to emancipate themselves from denominational fetters, have taken the name of "Christians." That, too, has lost the weighty significance that men attached to it, and some who scoff at the idea of Jesus being the Christ, or having any special divine mission, are wofully offended if you do not acknowledge them as Christians. We take every man to be a Christian, says the false and silly liberality of our times, who says he is one—no matter how wild his opinions may be. But "Evangelical Christian" appears to cover the whole ground, neither too much, nor too little. It embraces all who base their Christianity on the Gospels, and draw their knowledge of Christ, his mission and his doctrine, from these simple but sacred narratives.

TO A CHILD.

Gleesome, blithesome, bonnie boy!
Precious household treasure!
Lightly trip thy restless feet
To a joyful measure—
Thrills thy happy little heart
With exultant pleasure.

All day long thy silvery voice
Like a streamlet flows;
Through the hours at twilight dim,
Cradled for repose,
The blue-veiled, drooping eyelids,
Sealed with kisses, close.

Sheltered in the fond embrace
Of a mother's arms,
Naught cares he for night or shadow,
Storms bring no alarms;
Well he knoweth who will keep him
Safe from ills or harms.

Would I had thy faith, my darling,
When with care oppressed,
Weary, faint, to lay my head
On *His* loving breast,—
To seek my refuge in the arms
Of everlasting rest.

Oh, to cling, as thou art clinging,
When the shadows deep
Silently around my pathway
Like weird phantoms creep,
Closer to the heart which "giveth
His beloved sleep."

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 156.)

IX.—Thomas Read (1756 to 1812) was minister of Glenarm for the long period of fifty-six years. During the last twenty years of this time he had the services of an assistant, or rather of two assistants successively, viz., Messrs. Robert Acheson and Alexander Montgomery, the latter of whom succeeded him.

Mr. Read's settlement at Glenarm took place in the following manner:—At the first meeting of the Temple-

patrick Presbytery, which was held after the melancholy death of Mr. Thomas Brown (as detailed in my last paper), Joseph Hunter appeared as Commissioner from Glenarm, supplicating that supplies might be sent to that Congregation, which was done; and at the two ensuing meetings of Presbytery, a similar provision was made by the brethren for the supply of the spiritual wants of that people. It was not, however, until June 24, 1755, that there was any indication of the choice of the Glenarm Congregation being directed towards any individual as a successor to their late minister. On the day named, John M'Killup appeared at the Presbytery as Commissioner from Glenarm, "supplicating that Mr. Read, from the Presbytery of Route, might be obtained to supply them the month of July, and Mr. Fullerton, from Ballymena, the month of August." In both cases the request was granted, and the Presbytery took the necessary steps to procure them a hearing of the two gentlemen named. But Mr. Read, being first in the field, appears to have conquered so soon as he came to Glenarm; for the people of that Congregation, without waiting to hear Mr. Fullerton at all (who was shortly afterwards chosen in Carrickfergus), or indeed allowing Mr. Read himself to complete his probationary month, requested by their Commissioner, Joseph Hunter, of the Presbytery which met at Ballynure, July 19, 1755, "that Mr. Read might be procured from the Presbytery of Route to supply their Congregation from the third Sabbath of August till their next meeting, and also that a minister might be appointed to preach in Glenarm some Sabbath before the next meeting, and see a call subscribed by that Congregation to Mr. Read." This supplication was granted; and Mr. Rogers, of Ballynure (whose daughter the minister designate of Glenarm subsequently married), was appointed to write for Mr. Read, whilst Mr. William Thomson (2nd Larne) was directed to preach at Glenarm, so soon as that people should desire him, to see their call to Mr. Read subscribed. Accordingly, in due time the call to Mr. Read, which seems to have been quite unanimous, was subscribed by the Congregation of Glenarm in the presence of Mr. Thomson; and this call the Presbytery, at their next meeting on August 26, 1755, were requested

to recommend to Mr. Read, and at the same time supplicated to appoint a Committee to put Mr. Read upon ordination trials. Both requests were complied with, and Mr. Read was also appointed "to supply that Congregation for ordinary till next meeting." But the "ordination trials" were a somewhat tedious affair. Three months after the last-named date, viz. :—

"*Nov.* 4, 1755.—Appeared from Glenarm, Joseph George Augustus Eaton* and Christopher Dunn, supplicating that Mr. Read's trials for ordination might be forwarded, and that he might be made their constant supplier. Inquiry was made if the Committee appointed to meet at Glenarm had observed the appointment, and it appeared they did, and that, having received satisfactory credentials of Mr. Read's behaviour as a Christian and a preacher, they recommended the call from the people of Glenarm to his consideration, and appointed him, as a piece of trial, that question, viz., Whether the Moral Law be of perpetual obligation? upon which he was to deliver a discourse, as this day. The Presbytery approved the Committee's conduct, and granted the supplication from Glenarm. Mr. Read delivered his discourse, which was approved, and he was appointed a presbyterial exercise on Heb. xiii. 4."

If the reader turns to the passage above indicated (Heb. xiii. 4), he will find that it was rather a singular text to give to a young minister; but Mr. Read, who probably even then contemplated matrimony, was not deterred from occupying the delicate position assigned to him, and on December 15, 1755, delivered to the assembled fathers of the church a homily on the verse referred to, which was duly considered and approved. At the same time "appeared from Glenarm Messrs. John Creighton and David Brown,† supplicating that Mr. Read's trials might be hastened, and he continued their supplier till the next meeting of Presbytery." This request is stated to have been granted; but if we are to judge from the facts of the case, the prayer for haste in the matter of ordination trials does not seem to have been effectual; for two months afterwards, viz., on February 15, 1756, we again have Mr. Read delivering "a popular sermon" from Psalm xxxviii. 3, which was approved, and also

* The bearer of this euphonious name was the ancestor, by the mother's side, of the present Mr. A. Dickey, of Belfast. The Eaton family had a property in the Libert, near Glenarm.

† Messrs. Creighton and Brown were probably the sons, or other relatives, of the seventh and eighth ministers of Glenarm.

performing, to the satisfaction of the Presbytery, "the other pieces of usual trials," one of which was "praying before and after sermon in the Latin tongue." Being then asked "if he was willing to subscribe the Confession of Faith," he subscribed the following formula, viz.:—

"I believe the Westminster Confession of Faith contains a good system of Christian doctrines, which I subscribe as the confession of my faith.

"THOMAS READ."

At length, then, Mr. Read's trials of all kinds appeared to be over; and this being the case, Messrs. John Creighton, Robert Montgomery, and George Augustus Eaton, Commissioners from Glenarm, supplicated that the second Tuesday in March might be appointed for the day of his ordination to the ministerial office in Glenarm. At the same time these Commissioners produced a full discharge from Mr. John Blair, the executor of the late Rev. Mr. Brown, for all stipend due to that gentleman; and being asked by the Presbytery if they were prepared to give securities for Mr. Read's stipend, they answered that they were. Their request was therefore granted, and arrangements were made for the ordination of Mr. Read in Glenarm on the day named. Mr. Lewson, of Cairncastle, was appointed to preach at Glenarm on the first Sabbath in March, and serve the edict. Mr. Thompson, of Larne, was directed to attend at Glenarm on the Monday following, and, along with Mr. Lewson, see a bond or bonds perfected for Mr. Read's support. "The usual method of keeping a fast before an ordination was to be omitted at this time, on account of the fast lately observed by the Government's authority. Mr. Lewson to preside at the ordination of Mr. Read, and Mr. M'Connell, of Killead, to give the charge."

The following is the record of Mr. Read's ordination, as it appears in the Minutes of the Templepatrick Presbytery:—

"GLENARM, *March* 9, 1756.—At a meeting of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, *post preces* sederunt, Messrs. W. Thomson (Moderator), John M'Connell, John Lewson, and William Rogers; with Robert Allen, and James Craig, Elders, the edict was served, and the Committee appointed to meet at Glenarm inform the Presbytery that they met, and saw a bond perfected by a considerable

number of the principal people of this Congregation for forty pounds to be yearly paid to Mr. Read, during his residence as Dissenting minister in Glenarm. The sexton was sent to the several doors of the Meeting-house to inform the Congregation that the Presbytery now sitting were ready to hear objections, if any would be made, to the ordination of Mr. Read to the ministerial office in the Congregation of Glenarm.* None was offered. Mr. Lewson presided in the ordination of Mr. Read by preaching from ——— and the Presbytery ordained by the laying on of hands and prayer, and Mr. M'Connell gave the charge to Mr. Read and his Congregation, and concluded with prayer and praise."†

Thus ordained, the ninth minister of Glenarm, who, at the time of his ordination, was thirty-six years of age, as appears from the inscription on his tombstone, entered on the duties of his charge. How he discharged those duties may be gathered from the records of a Visitation Presbytery, which, just three years after his ordination, was held at

"Glenarm, *March* 11, 1759.—Mr. Read preached from 2 Tim. iv. 8, was considered, and approved. From the Session of Glenarm appeared as Commissioners, Messrs. John M'Collum, John Davidson, and Robert Montgomery. From the congregation appeared as Commissioners, Messrs. James M'Master and George Augustus Eaton, who, being asked how Mr. Read performed the duties of his office in preaching, praying, visiting, and catechising, answered

* This method of proceeding was invariably adopted at ordinations in the times of which we are now treating. Its object—and a most excellent one it was—evidently was to prevent the possibilty of an unseemly interruption, under any pretext, of the ordination services in the Meeting-house. Before entering upon the work of the day, the Presbytery met separately in the vestry, whilst the Congregation assembled in the Meeting-house, and it was to the former place that intending objectors to the contemplated ordination were invited to repair, there and then to make their objections, or ever after hold their peace.

† It will be observed that at the induction of Mr. Read there was no "defence of Presbyterian ordination." Indeed such "defence" was not inserted on the programme of Presbyterian ordination services until a later period, and I think it might now, without impropriety or disadvantage, be dispensed with altogether. If Presbyterian ministers have, as they allege, the right to ordain, it seems to be a piece of unnecessary self-humiliation on their part formally to defend that right on every occasion of their exercise of it. Their very exercise of the right implies their possession of it; and I think it would be more dignified for them to assume and exercise, *sub silentio*, the privilege which they claim, without appearing to contemplate the possibility of their conduct in so doing being called in question. It is thus, I believe, that other churches act on such occasions. I do not know that any other church condescends to make a defence of its right to ordain an integral part of its ordination service.

that they were all well satisfied with him as a Gospel minister, and that his behaviour in every respect was suitable to his character and agreeable to his congregation. The Commissioners from the congregation were also asked if the Session acquitted themselves becomingly in the discharge of their office. They answered that they did, and that they were sober, well behaved men, and kept a book of their records very regularly.* Mr. Read also gave the same account of his Session. The Presbytery desired to know how his congregation in general attended upon public worship and other means of improvement and edification. He informed them that they attended very well, and were sober and well-behaved people in general. Mr. Read and the Commissioners were asked if they had their accounts stated, and an account was produced by which it appeared that at the first of last February they owed Mr. Read £20. The Commissioners desired that a Committee of Presbytery might be appointed to meet at Glenarm in June next, when they hoped they would be able to give a more satisfactory account. This was agreed to, provided the Congregation of Glenarm see it necessary to renew this request at next meeting of Presbytery. This meeting concluded with prayer."

At next meeting of Presbytery nothing was said about the Glenarm accounts, nor was the subject again brought before the brethren until the next visitation of that Congregation, which was not held until ten years later, viz., on April 25, 1769.

In the meantime, viz., in 1762, the present Meeting-house of Glenarm was built. The date of its erection is fixed by the following inscription which appears engraved on a freestone slab inserted in the wall facing the old road:—

"This house was built in the year of our Lord, 1762. The enclosed ground on which it stands, with 30 guineas, was the bountiful donation of the Right Honourable Alexander, Earl of Antrim, to the Dissenters of Glenarm."

Respecting this inscription, I am bound by a regard for truth to say that the bountifulness of the Earl of Antrim in the matter therein alluded to is not generally supposed to have been so great as on this tablet it is represented to be. If the testimony of uniform tradition is to be believed, there was no bountifulness in the transaction at all. The facts of the case are stated to have

* I would give a good deal to know where this Glenarm Session-book is now. I have made inquiries after it in every quarter I could think of, but have not found the slightest cue either as to where it was, or where it is. I fear that like most Congregational records it is irrecoverably lost.

been as follows:—The old Meeting-house which preceded the one built in 1762, stood between the site of the present Meeting-house and the Parish Church. It was seen from the windows of Glenarm Castle, and being, we may well believe, a not very ornamental building, we can readily suppose that it was no addition to the beauty of the landscape. In fact we may admit that it was decidedly an eye-sore, and, under these circumstances, we are not surprised to hear that an agreement was entered into between Lord Antrim, the occupant of the Castle, and his tenantry, who were the occupants of the ugly old Meeting-house, according to which the latter unsightly edifice was to be removed, and another Meeting-house was to be built for them in some less conspicuous situation. To carry out this arrangement, Lord Antrim was of course obliged to give his tenantry a site for a new Meeting-house to replace the one which, for his own gratification, he caused to be thrown down. He also seems to have given the sum of Thirty Guineas towards the building of the new Meeting-house; but this money should rather be regarded as the price—and not the extravagant price—which his Lordship paid for his whistle, *i.e.*, the removal of the old Meeting-house, than as a "bountiful donation to the dissenters of Glenarm." In fact the whole affair was an affair of barter, not of gift.*

(To be continued.)

* Strange to say, the new Meeting-house, or rather, as it may now be called, the present old Meeting-house, although it was built under the circumstances stated in the text, became in its turn disagreeable to the inmates of Glenarm Castle. The late Mr. M'Donnell, when, as husband of the late Anne Katherine in her own right Countess of Antrim, he was proprietor of the Antrim Estate, made many attempts to have it removed. For so doing, he alleged reasons precisely similar to those which, in the case of the old Meeting-house, had been successfully urged in 1762 by the Earl of Antrim. But where the Peer had succeeded, the Commoner failed. The minister with whom the latter gentleman had to deal was not so accommodating as Mr. Read appears to have been. On one occasion Mr. M'Donnell proposed to that minister, the late Rev. A. Montgomery, of Glenarm, that if he would induce his people to leave their Meeting-house, and give it up to him, he would build them a much better one elsewhere. Mr. Montgomery's reply to this plausible proposal deserves to be recorded. "Mr. M'Donnell, you can build a new Meeting-house. If we like it as well as the old one, we will exchange keys with you; but, in the meantime, we will occupy our old house until your new one is built." The proposal and rejoinder were eminently character-

ADDRESS OF THE REV. SAMUEL BACHE

To the Members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, at their Annual Meeting, held in the Unitarian Chapel, Hackney, London, on Wednesday, May 23, 1866, Jerom Murch, Esq., President, in the Chair.

Mr. President, and all you my other Christian friends of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association,—I now rise to move, in conformity with the notice which I have already given to the Committee of this Association, that to Rule I., which affirms that "The Association is formed for the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad," the following addition be made: "these principles including the recognition of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as the only God and the only proper Object of religious worship, and also the recognition of the special divine mission and authority, as a religious teacher, of Jesus Christ himself."

I have written what I have now to address to you, in order that I might have my mind free to attend to the discourse which we have just heard, and join in the solemn worship in which we have just engaged, and then might be more clear and concise than I could possibly be without this exact preparation. I earnestly request your candid attention to my statements and arguments, and your unprejudiced consideration of them.

In order to bring before this meeting the motion of which I have given notice, as clearly, and definitely, and concisely as possible, let me commence with the distinct but brief statement of what I regard as facts and principles which cannot be reasonably or justly called in question.

1. The British and Foreign Unitarian Association is an absolutely free and voluntary Association.

istic of the two parties concerned. My old friend and neighbour, who was a man of classical tastes and acquirements, evidently did not much relish his landlord's attempted application in this instance of the figure *heusteron proteron*, in other words, he would not throw out the dirty water until he had *got* the clean. I need scarcely add, that Mr. Montgomery's reply to Mr. M'Donnell put an effectual stop to the negotiation for the removal of the present Meeting-house, which still stands, and I trust will long stand, where it was built in 1762. Indeed, for many years past, I have not heard of a wish being expressed in any quarter that it should be removed.

2. It is primarily and fundamentally a *doctrinal* Association, as distinctly avowed and attested by the Conference which was held in Essex Street Chapel on Wednesday, April 18th.

3. The characteristic doctrines, for the promotion of which it was originally formed, involved as fundamental those which it is the object of my motion to define; the necessity for such definition having been raised by an endeavour on the part of some influential members of the Association to empty the words "Unitarian" and "Christianity" of their original meaning, and to substitute for it a meaning which the founders of the Association have distinctly repudiated, and which I and many others of its present members cannot conscientiously accept. This is, in effect, changing the very object of the Association, without giving its members an opportunity of deciding whether they will accept the change or not.

Is it any infringement of justice or freedom on my part to demand, as I now do, that such a change shall be resisted and repudiated? In order to understand the question, consider it in relation to any voluntary association for the promotion of some secular object. Since our last annual meeting, a Limited Liability Banking Company has been formed in Birmingham, of which many of my friends are members. When the originators of this Company issued their first prospectus, there was one expression in it, the meaning of which was somewhat ambiguous. Immediately appeals were made to them, through the public papers, requesting them to remove this ambiguity—a request with which they immediately complied. Did any one of them even suggest that the demand for definiteness regarding the principles and objects of this Association involved any infringement of the liberty of the shareholders? Certainly not. And suppose, now that the Company is established, some of its directors were to transfer any portion of its capital to the work of the Thames Embankment Company, on the plea that that is a Banking Company too, would the shareholders sanction such a plea, even though they might approve of the transfer? I reply with equal confidence, Certainly not. It were a practical absurdity, which, in all secular matters, would soon bring down its own penal correction, for men

to invest their money in associations for the accomplishment of objects which they would not distinctly define. Does the clear definition of such objects, then, involve any violation of justice or freedom? Quite the reverse. It is absolutely necessary to the conservation of both.

Apply these clear, and rational, and, as I think, unquestionable principles of secular justice and freedom, to the case of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. It is fundamentally a *doctrinal* Association, *i.e.*, an association formed for the maintenance and diffusion of certain distinctive doctrines. Are you unwilling to avow, and maintain, and recommend to the consideration of others, any distinctive doctrines at all? Do you think that such avowal and maintenance implies restriction of your own or of other men's freedom of thought? Then do not join the Association, or if you have joined it, retire from it; but do not endeavour to pervert its primary and definite objects, and to deprive those who have laboured earnestly for the accomplishment of these objects, of the funds which they have raised for the promotion of them. From a moral point of view (I know nothing of mere *legal* technicalities) such a proceeding will be, in my judgment, both dishonest and tyrannical, and I will not in any way sanction it or submit to it. So long as there remain members of the Association who are willing to carry out its original objects, to them its funds and agencies justly belong; and no casual majority, however large, has any moral right to deprive them of those funds and agencies.

At the time when the British and Foreign Unitarian Association was formed, the meaning of both the terms by which the object of the Association is expressed in Rule I., was clear, and definite, and undisputed. Doctrinal Christianity was universally maintained by Unitarians, equally with Trinitarians, as the distinctive designation of the belief in Jesus as the Christ, in his mission, and inspiration, and doctrine as immediately and specially divine, and as carrying with them a direct divine authority. The difference between Unitarian and Trinitarian was simply a difference of interpretation of what both parties equally reverenced as an immediate

and special revelation from God, through Jesus Christ. It involved no difference of opinion at all respecting the special and authoritative character of that revelation itself. Hear the following brief extract from a sermon entitled, "The Authority of Jesus as a Divinely Inspired Teacher, sufficient for the Evidence and the Efficacy of Christianity," by the Rev. John Kenrick, at that time Classical Tutor of Manchester College, York, reviewed in *The Christian Reformer*, 1837, pp. 150—155 :—

"To us all other classes of believers unite in imputing heresies, which render us unworthy of communion with Christians. Is it wonderful if we feel indignation at a charge persisted in, notwithstanding our declarations that we receive the authority of Christ and of Scripture as reverently as they do, and only differ from them respecting the true doctrine of Scripture? To justify the distrust and alienation with which we are viewed, as denying the doctrine of the Trinity, it should be shown that we deny the authority of Christ as an inspired teacher. Grant, for argument's sake, that we are wrong in our interpretation of every text which is in dispute between us and our Trinitarian opponents; till they can show that more is involved in the scriptural notion of belief in Christ than belief in his being the Messiah, or that we are hypocrites when we profess that we receive him as such, they have no right to say that we deny him, because we deny their notions of his nature. . . . The habit of dwelling upon and exaggerating the differences of our creeds produces consequences the most unfavourable to the spirit of Christian love. They are not unimportant; if we thought them so, we should not associate ourselves for the profession and diffusion of our own opinions. A harmless error is as much a contradiction in terms as a salutary disease. But we are not, therefore, to command every one in whose religious opinions we think we discover some slight taint of unsoundness, to go without the camp, as if he were afflicted with the leprosy or the pestilence. . . . It is possible to combine the most earnest desire for religious knowledge, the most diligent endeavour to obtain it, and the deepest sense of its value, with brotherly affection and a candid judgment towards those who call very opposite opinions by the name of truth. You may pursue your own path, and yet 'bid God speed' to the travellers who are taking an opposite road, if you believe them to be bound on a lawful errand. Buy the truth and sell it not: sell all that you have and buy it: but, since less than an infallible judgment cannot inform you whether you have found the pearl of great price or not, neither revile nor despise those who have sought for it with equal industry and paid as high a price for it as yourselves."

To these fundamental principles our orthodox fellow-Christians still practically adhere; and, as the result of that adherence, are many of them avowedly modifying their

views of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, because they discern that the interpretation on which they originally rested those views cannot be rationally or scripturally maintained. And such is still the judgment and the usage, not only of all our orthodox fellow-Christians, but also of intelligent and upright men (several of whom it is my honour and privilege to call my friends, and to co-operate earnestly with them in works of general benevolence), who conscientiously reject the divine mission and authority of Jesus of Nazareth, and who, therefore, consistently avow themselves Jews or Deists, as the case may be, and would think it folly and fraud to call themselves Christians, though they are individually as observant of all the demands of Christian morality, as if they acknowledged that divine mission and authority. This I affirm from my own personal knowledge, and after much careful inquiry: so that general usage still maintains the definite etymological and historical meaning of the word Christian and its correlatives in their primary sense, notwithstanding the endeavours which are being made by a section of our small denomination to empty them of that primary meaning. I resist those endeavours on the very principle justly laid down by a writer signing himself "J. J. T." in the *Theological Review* for July, 1865, whose words are as follows:—

> "We must earnestly protest against this theological juggling with words. It is a most unhealthy sign of the times. It tends to render the language reserved for the highest themes utterly meaningless, and to foster the too prevalent notion that theology is a vain talk about nothing."

In requiring, therefore, that the meaning of the term "Unitarian Christianity," shall be clearly defined, I am simply giving a practical application to this just and earnest protest, and resisting the "theological juggling," which, if unopposed, would in no long time annihilate theology altogether. I am not importing any new idea or principle at all, but simply refusing to sanction the proceedings of those members who are avowedly rooting out the ideas and principles which were originally recognised as the basis of our Association, in order that it may be maintained on that basis.

It seems to be a prevalent opinion with many of the

new and (as they are frequently called) advanced school of Unitarians, that to associate for the recommendation to others of our clear and definite convictions, is to impede the progress of free enquiry, and the search after truth. On the contrary, I am fully persuaded, both by reason and experience, that such association, wherever it is perfectly voluntary and free, as ours is, encourages progress, and aids the discovery of truth just in proportion to the clearness with which its principles and objects are defined and maintained. By clearly and definitely avowing and recommending to others our own convictions, we do not seek to *impose* those convictions upon them. We simply appeal to the minds of our brethren in the conscientious exercise of their own individual freedom. Our language is, "These are our characteristic opinions, and the grounds on which they rest. Look at them, examine them, and judge for yourselves. To us they seem both true and important. We therefore commend them to your serious and candid consideration." Do we utter any denunciation or anathema against those who cannot accept them? Do we allow or cherish any feeling of hostility towards them? Assuredly not. Ought we then to give indefiniteness or haziness to the statement of our opinions and arguments for the purpose of winning such persons over to our sect or Association? I again reply, Assuredly not.

In this view of the necessity and value of distinct and separate association, I am supported by both the sentiments and conduct of the late excellent Dr. Channing. Writing of the Hicksite Quakers, he declares,—

"In what I have said I mean not to condemn. I want more extensive knowledge of the views of this body of Quakers. I simply mean to say that, as a Unitarian, I have no disposition to identify their cause with my own, and for this simple reason, that we differ in some important respects. I can greet them as friends and brothers, just as I greet all good and pious men of all classes of Christians. I can and do rejoice that they have thrown off the bondage of human creeds. I hope much from the spirit of inquiry which is at work among them. But I have fears, too, and I must say, many fears. I fear that they may prefer what they esteem a particular inspiration communicated to themselves to the everlasting and universal lights of reason and of the Christian revelation. I fear that a false standard may gradually supplant the true ones. I shall rejoice to find that I err: but it seems to me not wise to

expose ourselves to misapprehensions by seeming to ally ourselves with those concerning whom we cannot but fear."—*Memoirs of Channing;* Vol. ii. p. 467. London: J. Chapman. 1848.

Precisely on this very principle, and because I object to certain opinions and tendencies which are very nearly identical with those which Dr. Channing here distinctly repudiates, I will not expose myself to misapprehension by seeming to ally myself with those concerning whom I cannot but fear. Gladly and earnestly will I continue to co-operate for the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity with those members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association who distinctly recognise the sole deity of the One God our Father, and the special divine mission, inspiration, and authority, as a religious teacher, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But with those who avowedly maintain such an interpretation of the terms "Unitarian Christianity," as excludes the devout recognition of these distinctive fundamental doctrines, I cannot conscientiously permit myself to be associated in doctrinal union, inasmuch as such an interpretation involves opinions which are diametrically opposed to my own, and which seem to me as mischievous as they are erroneous, threatening reaction of a most injurious kind. In expressing this determination, and my resolution to give it practical effect, I am not in the least presuming to dictate to any man, or to condemn him for differing from me. My language to every man with whom I come in contact is still what it always has been (as many of my correspondents can testify)—"Follow your light; but if that which is light to you be darkness to me, do not suppose that I cherish any sentiment of hostility or alienation towards you in my heart, if I honestly avow that I cannot go with you, but must take for myself, it may be, the very opposite path, if my own light so lead me."

Such are the views which I distinctly avowed in my Address to my fellow-members of this Association, published in *The Inquirer* of August 12, 1865. Immediately I was assailed with charges of intolerance and bigotry, to which I could not by possibility make any more definite and conclusive reply than that which this very Address contains; and hence the calm and friendly discussion

which my friend, the Rev. J. Panton Ham, had earnestly striven to insure, was, at the very outset, rendered impossible, and has ever since been practically rejected by *The Inquirer*. Since publishing that Address, I have studied very attentively the letters and publications bearing on this subject of my highly esteemed and beloved friends, the Professors of Manchester New College; and, as the result, am enabled to state very briefly, in conclusion, how I have been confirmed by them in the views which I have already avowed, and in the practical resolution consequent upon them. If I understand my friends aright—(and I shall heartily thank them to correct me if I am mistaken)—the difference of opinion and principle between us is vital and fundamental. Our worthy Professors appear to me to regard Christianity as nothing more than a divine influence, to be utilised by us in our day and generation, according to our individual conceptions of it. I regard it, on the contrary, as involving a sacred personal relationship, and a no less sacred trust, in connection with all who accept it. They seem to conceive it possible to detach the Spirit of Christ from Christ himself, and to preach to men in the present circumstances of the world in the same way, and through the same kind of appeal to the wants of the inward man, as our Lord and his apostles would do were they now on earth. "In my last letter," writes Mr. J. J. Tayler in *The Inquirer* of October 28, 1865, "I was perhaps rather too diffuse in developing my conception of Christianity as the spirit of a life rather than a system of doctrinal belief." But can we deal with it in what is primarily a doctrinal Association in this character only? I recognise the Christian spirit as being pretty equally diffused among Christians of all denominations, and as exercised by many who, under its unconscious influence, frankly avow their repudiation of the Christian faith and name. I feel myself in unity of spirit with all conscientious and upright men, whatever be their doctrinal belief, and desire and endeavour to live in brotherly union with them. My conviction, at the same time, is distinct and decided, that I sustain a sacred personal relation to Jesus Christ, that I am a servant of the members of my church "for Jesus' sake," and that I am therefore bound to preach not myself, but Christ Jesus

the Lord. I dare not, therefore, neglect or set aside, because I cannot repudiate, his special divine mission and authority, or the allegiance from me which it demands. To withhold the distinct confession and avowal of this or any other cardinal truth in connection with an Association avowedly formed for the promotion of such truth is, in my judgment, treason against it.

In making these statements, I do not even imply any condemnation of my friends from whom I differ. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," and then let him, of course, follow his own convictions. My dear friends, the Professors of Manchester New College, are, I doubt not, doing what they regard as good and great service on their principles, and I wish them "God speed" in their earnest and generous labours. But looking at the subject from my point of view, they appear to me to be doing that service at a cost and risk which I cannot sanction. "Other foundation can no man lay (writes St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 11) than that which is laid, which is Jesus the Christ." "Whoever believes this" writes Mr. Belsham, with whom I here entirely agree, "is a member of the Christian community, whatever errors may be attached to his belief. Whoever denies that Jesus is the Messiah is an unbeliever, he is not a member of the Christian Church." Entertaining these views, I cannot join in formal and responsible doctrinal association with men who distinctly deny the Messiahship and authority of Jesus, or sanction the leaving the terms of that association open to such vague and irrational interpretation as shall reverse the very principles and aims of those by whom it was originally established, and of many of those by whom it is still maintained.

They who conscientiously reject, or set aside as of no importance, the divine authority of Christ, are *not* morally responsible for refusing to recognise and maintain it. I and those who agree with me on this doctrinal point *are*, I think, strictly responsible, and therefore are not at liberty, in my judgment, to merge our avowal of doctrinal belief in a word which is now maintained by some persons to be not necessarily expressive of it. Hence I cannot but require a distinct statement of the doctrinal principles which this Association is formed to promote,

seeing that the words originally employed to designate them are now being emptied of the meaning which they were originally employed to express. Believing, as I do, in the divine mission and authority of Christ Jesus my Lord, I no less confidently believe that ere long I shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ and be judged by the very word which he hath spoken,—in which I read—"Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven: but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. x. 32, 33). My dear friends, who interpret these words and so many others differently from myself, will be justly judged by their own interpretation and will not be denied or condemned; for they have honourably and usefully followed their own convictions. How can I ever hope to meet them in that higher and holier state, if I do not endeavour as honourably and usefully to follow mine? By joining in conscious and voluntary doctrinal association with those who avowedly deny Jesus to be the Christ for the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity, I consciously sanction such denial. This I dare not do; my allegiance to Jesus Christ as my Lord forbids it. "For with me (as with the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 3) it is a very small thing that I should be judged by you or by man's judgment; but he that judgeth me is the Lord." And I am fully sustained under the gross misrepresentations and unwarrantable censures to which I have already been subjected, and which I may perhaps have still further to endure, by the assurance of this same Lord, my teacher and Saviour as well as my final judge, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven" (Matt. v. 11, 12).

Thus, if I should be compelled to separate from you now, my Christian friends, as members of a doctrinal association, it is mainly in order that I may rejoin you hereafter and dwell with you for ever, when you will see and know that it is in no spirit of alienation and hostility, but in the spirit of truth and love, that I now endeavour to carry out my own most sacred convictions: my antici-

pations of that future and eternal world being those which are so clearly and feelingly expressed by a beloved and venerated friend, the Rev. Edmund Butcher, who has, for many years past, been called to his reward, in his beautiful hymn on "the final acceptance of all who fear God and work righteousness"—a hymn with which many of you are probably familiar, and which embodies in its closing lines the very principle on which I am acting.

"From north and south, from east and west,
Advance the myriads of the bless'd;
From every clime of earth they come,
And find in heaven a common home.

In one immortal throng we view
Pagan and Christian, Greek and Jew;
But all their doubts and darkness o'er,
One only God they now adore.

Howe'er divided here below,
One bliss, one spirit now they know;
Though some ne'er heard of Jesus' name,
Yet God admits their humble claim.

On earth, according to their light,
They aimed to practise what is right:
Now all their errors are forgiven,
And Jesus welcomes them to heaven."

May we all, my beloved friends, receive that blessed welcome through Jesus Christ our Lord!

To sum up, in conclusion, these observations and arguments. I have shown you that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association is avowedly an association for the maintenance and promulgation of certain distinctive and characteristic doctrines designated Unitarian Christianity. I have shown you that no ambiguity originally existed in regard to the meaning of these descriptive terms, and that none exists, even at the present day, except in a small section of our small denomination, with whom I cannot conscientiously unite for doctrinal profession or promulgation. Will it be just, then, for the representatives of this section to wrest from even a minority, at this annual meeting of the members of the Association, the funds and agencies which they are still desirous of honestly and perseveringly applying for the promotion of the very principles which the Association was originally constituted

to maintain? In hearty accordance with the views so clearly expressed and ably maintained in an article on this very important subject, signed "Justitia," which appeared in the February number of the Belfast *Christian Unitarian*, after having been refused, months before, by the Editor of the London *Inquirer*, I say that it will *not* be just, and that I will not sanction such a proceeding. If you do not approve of a doctrinal association, you are bound, in all fairness, to withdraw from it; if you do approve of it, you are equally bound, in all fairness, (as I think,) to resist the annihilation of its original doctrines by the mere "word juggling" which "J. J. T." so wisely and earnestly condemns. Define the essential principles of Unitarian Christianity if you would still continue united to promote them, and do not suffer them to be annihilated by that private haziness which, under the name of freedom, is beginning to exercise a tyranny which would not be tolerated for a moment in connection with any secular interests, and to which, therefore, I will never subject myself in connection with those highest interests which are spiritual and eternal. Hence I move that Rule I., which affirms that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association "is formed for the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad," be maintained in its original clearness and definiteness by the following addition: "these principles including the recognition of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as the only God and the only proper Object of religious worship, and also the recognition of the special divine mission and authority, as a religious teacher, of Jesus Christ himself."

REVIEW OF RECENT PROCEEDINGS IN THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

We have thought it right to give, in our Intelligence department, the substance of the speeches made at the recent meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, in connexion with the important motion of the Rev. S. Bache, while we are glad to be able to publish more prominently the clear and earnest address of that gentleman in introducing his motion. We had enter-

tained the hope that, although Mr. Bache had every reason to expect defeat, the great question which now agitates the Unitarian body, and must sooner or later divide it, would have been fully discussed, so that many who have hitherto regarded it as of minor importance, or have looked on it simply as a matter of "creed, or no creed," should see it in its true light, and come to know that it is, as long ago we urged, a question of "Christ, or no Christ."

Objection has been made by some who sympathise more or less with Mr. Bache's views, that nothing had been published by the Association tending to compromise its Christian character, or give countenance to the views against which Mr. Bache's motion was directed. That is perfectly true: but some of the leading members of the Association had identified themselves with the party who seek to include in Unitarian Christianity, by a breadth of interpretation which, till lately, was never dreamed of, all who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, whether or not they believe in a Divine Revelation; and journals which professed to be the organs of the denomination had distinctly and persistently advocated the same novel view; while some, who occupied Unitarian pulpits, preached and published a form of religious opinion which, let their friends colour the matter as they may, is not distinguishable from mere Deism. The fact is, that so far as our "modern" Unitarians are concerned, Deism is a form of religious thought which has entirely disappeared; it has entered the widening door of our *Free* Church, and found itself a welcome guest. When the meaning of the name, by which the Association had been designated, was thus completely altered, and, as Mr. Bache truly says, in the mind of many "emptied" of its most important ideas, it was time for any true friend of the Association to step forward and ask to have its principles and objects more distinctly defined. Men who have any title to be regarded as sensible never form themselves into a society without having a clear understanding of its aims: they do not associate for the purpose of promoting or opposing *anything and everything:* they must know the object aimed at, else they cannot tell whether or not they could conscientiously support it.

Till lately the term "Unitarian Christianity" was understood well enough: it embraced two principles,—the maintenance of Christianity as against unbelief, and the advocacy of Unitarianism as against the prevailing doctrine of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. There were diversities of opinion among the originators and early supporters of the Association. Some believed in the pre-existence of Christ, and many did not. On other points also they differed; but they all had implicit faith in the divine mission of the Saviour; and we challenge Mr. Bache's opponents to show that the wild views which now assume the Unitarian name were, till very recently, professed by any of its supporters.

It must have been gratifying to Mr. Bache, and to many friends of the Association through the country, that one so widely honoured and revered as the senior minister of Essex Street Chapel, rose to second the motion. Mr. Madge went directly to the marrow of the question, and, singling out one article in the Christian faith,—the resurrection of Christ,—the rejection of which he regarded as essentially a rejection of Christianity as a revealed religion, he declared, with as much truth as force—"*a church, calling itself Christian, without a risen Christ, is a church built upon the sand, and must fall to the ground.*" The views thus brought forward by Mr. Madge recalled to our mind a remarkable conversation which we had several years ago with an aged minister of the Remonstrant Synod. The controversy which latterly disturbed that body had just commenced, and the Three Questions introduced by Dr. Montgomery were the subject spoken of. He objected to them as possessing the character of a creed. "Be it so," we said, "would you ordain to the Christian ministry any man, provided only he was properly educated, even if he had no faith in Revealed Religion?" The old man paused for a moment, and then thoughtfully replied, "*There must be some test.*" "What test, then," we asked, "would you employ, if not an acknowledgment of the Divine Mission of the Saviour?" "A belief," he said, "in the Resurrection of Christ." Mr. Madge justly remarked that a belief in this crowning miracle involves "the testimony of God himself to the divine mission and authority of Christ."

Sir John Bowring opposed the motion, and in doing so contended for the fullest liberty within the Association. He alleged that any effort to determine the precise object for which they were united, and to limit the meaning of the term "Unitarian Christianity," was only a repetition of the old story—"On my side is truth, on your side is error." But the learned knight should bear in mind that the blow thus aimed at his opponents struck himself with equal force. As a member of a Unitarian Society, he meant to exclude all Trinitarians; and they might, with as much reason, accuse him of acting on the principle—"On my side truth, on yours error." And so, too, might Sir John's friends among the idolaters of India and China; for we do not suppose he would desire to open the doors of the Association so wide as to admit these into membership, and place them on its Committee. Mr. Bache and Mr. Madge do not say, "We have the truth, and all others are in error;" but, like Sir John himself, they hold certain religious views which they believe to be true and precious; and, while they do not interfere with the liberties of others or condemn them, they feel constrained to cherish and protect their own convictions. If men will not do so, but will regard all opinions as indifferently true or false, there must be an end to that progress which Sir John so ardently desires. Sir John deplored an alleged attempt to impose new creeds, and moved "the previous question." Now, there was no attempt to impose a new creed, but simply an endeavour to protect principles formerly well enough understood, but latterly by the latitudinarianism of the aged knight and his companions, nigh hand swept away; and to move "the previous question" was only an ingenious, and, we regret to add, successful effort to stave off discussion, and retain in apparent union principles which are as opposite as light and darkness.

The Rev. T. L. Marshall seconded the amendment, and contended that the question "was not one of old school and new school, but of free thought or limitation of free thought." He is right, at least in saying that it is a question of free thought or limitation of free thought—not, indeed, absolutely, but within the Association. We do not think that those whom Mr. Marshall so fre-

quently denounces as narrow-minded and bigoted, are a whit less the advocates of free thought than himself, but they have no faith in an Association based on free thought; and neither has Mr. Marshall: he would allow only a little more license; just so much as would bring within a Christian organization men who admit the excellence of Christ's spirit, but deny his mission from God: but we presume that were any one to propose the admission of George Holyoake and his secularist principles, Mr. Marshall would argue for a limit of free thought, and thereby expose himself to the very charge which he brings against others.

After some remarks, in support of the original motion, from Mr. James Yates, the discussion was terminated by a speech from the Secretary of the Association, the Rev. R. B. Aspland, who signified his entire sympathy with the views of Mr. Bache and Mr. Madge, but felt himself, at the same time, constrained to vote for the amendment. We doubt not that he and others felt themselves justified in such a course, and we do not judge them: but when he says that, according to the fundamental principles of the Association, "it is left to every man's conscience and good sense to decide what is Unitarianism, and what is Christianity," he strips the Association of any fixed character, or definite object, and virtually intimates that, consistently with its spirit, it may become an organization for the spread of modern Deism, or old-fashioned Trinitarianism; for Deists now-a-days say that they are Christians—in a sense;—and Trinitarians argue that they believe in the unity of the Deity, and therefore—in a sense—are Unitarians.

The Rev. J. J. Tayler next introduced his motion, the object of which was so to modify the Association that it would possess the confidence and support of all liberal Christian Churches, or to suggest the organization of a new society more comprehensive in its basis. He and others object to the name "Unitarian"; and Alderman J. C. Lawrence, who opposed the motion, alleged that, according to Mr. Tayler's view, no congregation having any denominational title, as "Unitarian," or "Baptist," could claim connexion with it. Thus, under an ideal liberalism, there would be thorough illiberality. The re-

sult was, that, after a good deal of discussion, in which Mr. Tayler's party were charged with breaking through a certain arrangement, a committee of twenty-four, representing the several parties in the Association, was appointed to consider the matters recommended in Mr. Tayler's motion. The result, we presume, may not be made known till the next annual meeting; but we are sure that the Association cannot, with any regard to law or right, be so modified as to meet Mr. Tayler's wishes; it cannot be converted into a kind of theological looking-glass, that would reflect the opinions of every one who approaches it; it cannot honourably abandon the principles it was established to promote, nor can it unite, in efforts for the circulation of Christian knowledge, schools essentially so distinct as those of Channing and Parker.

THE LATE NON-SUBSCRIBING MEETINGS.

The meetings of the Remonstrant Synod and the Non-Subscribing Association, briefly reported in our Intelligence, present little which requires comment. If there was not much business, there was not much strife. The Synod passed a resolution, afterwards adopted by the Association, for the establishment of a theological library, which, if judiciously managed, may prove an important aid to ministers and students; but, if otherwise, may do some mischief. The Rev. J. Orr, in introducing this resolution, is reported as giving a very exaggerated view of the "comprehensiveness" of the Non-Subscribing body. No man certainly can be a minister of any of its congregations who is not a Presbyterian and a Non-Subscriber. A Quaker, therefore, however excellent, would be excluded, for he is not a Presbyterian. When Mr. Orr suggested that little more than personal antipathies divided the Association, he gave expression to a very prevalent, but very erroneous opinion. Personal antipathies there have been, but there never should have been: no difference of opinion could justify them. But the Association is divided on the important question—Shall we, or shall we not, require every candidate whom we license or ordain, to signify his belief in the Divine Mission of the Saviour? No principle more important has ever divided churches.

The Synod paid a just and graceful tribute to the memory of him who was for so many years its strength and its ornament, whose wisdom founded it, and whose eloquence gained for it much of the importance which it attained.

In the Association there was a threatening of discord; but the Secretary, who had inserted some things in the minutes which should not have been there, stated that he did not mean, in what he had done, to cast any imputation on the late President, and the

matter was hushed up. A very judicious suggestion of the Rev. S. C. Nelson, to have the annual examinations of students public, was adopted; but Mr. Nelson was injudicious in adding that an address should be delivered by the President at the close of the session. Better that there should be no address, and that the sermon which hitherto has been preached at each general meeting should be discontinued; for Mr. Nelson will remember that it was in a Presidential sermon or address the first apple of discord was flung into the Association. The less that is said or done beyond the mere business in hand, the better for the cause of peace. The Association may still be useful as a means of promoting the cause of Religious Liberty, and watching over the interests of the Non-Subscribing churches; but any attempt to make it a united church organization must only result in its dissolution.

INTELLIGENCE.

SPEECHES AT THE LATE MEETING OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

In our last number we gave an outline of the proceedings at the late meeting of this Association, and we now publish a condensed report of the principal speeches on the motion of the Rev. S. Bache. After the reading of the Report, Mr. Bache rose and introduced the motion which, with the address in which he supported it, we have given at length in an earlier part of our present number.

The Rev. T. Madge, said—I rise to second the motion of my friend Mr. Bache; and in doing so I am anxious to state that, in my estimation, the resurrection is the great and all-important fact in the history of Christ; and I would, therefore, say with the Apostle Paul, [that if Christ be not risen, then is "our preaching vain, and your faith also is vain." Even Strauss himself is obliged to admit that faith in the resurrection was the foundation stone, without which the Church of Christ could not have been built. Dr. Hedge, also, the Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Harvard University, says, in his work on "Reason in Religion," I quote his very words, "Criticism has done its uttermost with the New Testament. What is now left standing is likely to stand; and what is it that is thus secured to us? Enough to substantiate, to fair and rational criticism, the *crowning fact of the resurrection.*" Now, I say, take away this crowning fact, and you destroy in man the great hope of humanity; take away this fact, and you take away that in which not only some of the best men that ever lived, but that on which the hearts of millions mainly rest their belief in a future state. If this be admitted, I am satisfied. I ask for nothing more. We have, in that case, the testimony of God himself to the divine mission and authority of Christ. But if this be not admitted—if this great miracle of the Gospel be denied or rejected—then, sir, I must say that I have not the slightest sympathy with such persons,

and must, therefore, seek the communion or fellowship of those, whether Unitarian or not, with whom, in this essential point, I am in entire agreement. A church calling itself Christian, without a risen Christ, is a church built upon the sand, and must fall to the ground. These, at least, are my views, and by them, narrow as they may be called, as everything else will be so called which is in any degree opposed to modern scepticism—by them I am resolved to abide.

After a few words from the Rev. T. L. MARSHALL, who spoke amid loud and frequent interruptions, in vindication of *The Inquirer* from some remarks of Mr. Bache,

Sir JOHN BOWRING said he should move an amendment to Mr. Bache's motion. He was a fragment of old times, and had something to do with those who organised that Association. From its very origin it was felt that some difficulty would attach to a definition of the term "Unitarian Christianity;" and when gentlemen came forward and asked for a definition and meaning attached to those terms, the venerable father of their present excellent Secretary said, "If you propose to reject the term Unitarian, bring to us some more acceptable term." Certainly, the doubt that existed in their minds then had been strengthened by what he now saw—that this very term "Unitarian" might be made the instrument of invasion into the rights and duties of conscience, so that when men have come and asked to join the Association, many have been prevented by the avowal, "Unless your convictions and your doctrines are ours, with you we cannot labour." This was but a repetition of the old story, "On my side is truth; on your side is error. I am in the light; you are in the darkness." We lived in an age in which all churches were widening their doors, not narrowing them. In these days of emancipation, when the mind is freeing itself, when he was told to fear nothing from inquiry, because the result of inquiry must be the triumph of truth, he had heard with great sorrow of these attempts to impose new creeds and to insist upon new definitions. He should move the previous question.

The Rev. T. L. MARSHALL seconded the amendment. The question was not a question of new school or old school; it was a question of free thought, or the limitation of free thought. He objected not theologically to Mr. Bache's views, but he objected to any definition or test whatever. He regarded the motion in the nature of a test; and although it was a test which every member of the Association might accept, yet it did not alter the principle; it was a test, and it was introduced for the express purpose of excluding some other parties who were willing to join with them and to work with them. Therefore, he was justified in saying the motion was essentially the embodiment of orthodox narrowness and intolerance.

Mr. JAMES YATES stated that at the formation of the Unitarian Society, in 1793, it made a distinct profession of its principles, and also gave a definition of what Unitarianism is. Dr. Priestley, Mr. Belsham, and other founders of the Society, gave their money and their influence; and we were now throwing aside the important principles which they laid down, as if they were of no importance. Until within the last two or three years the Society had always pur-

sued the same objects. Those objects were two-fold; they were directed partly against orthodoxy and partly against infidelity. The tendency of the sayings and doings of these gentlemen who talked so lightly about Unitarianism, was to sap the foundation of religion and morality.

The Rev. R. Brook Aspland said it was with great pain he found himself compelled, on this occasion, to separate himself from his old friends, Mr. Bache and Mr. Madge; but he did not mean, as long as he held his present convictions, to separate from them, in the slightest degree, in the public advocacy of those principles which they and he believed in common. He had always asserted, that whatever might be the policy which it was necessary to pursue with respect to the Unitarian Association, as its Secretary, he would never, for a moment, consent to give up the right of free speech elsewhere, or of free thought upon all subjects, and the power of vindicating that which he believed to be religious truth. Seven years ago he had the honour of discussing many of the topics which were to be brought forward on the present occasion, with his friend, Mr. Martineau, and in a pamphlet, which he published on that occasion, he expressed what his view was as to the constitution of the Unitarian Association:—"That Society is simply an organisation for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity. How liberal the spirit in which the Society was formed is evinced by the absence of all definition, whether of Unitarianism or Christianity. To every man's conscience and good sense it is left to decide what is Unitarianism and what is Christianity, and, so far as membership of the Association goes, no one is compromised by another man's views of these subjects."

The Chairman then put the amendment of Sir John Bowring, and it was carried by a majority of more than a hundred, only three or four hands being held up against it.

The Rev. J. J. Tayler then introduced his motion, which we gave in our last number. We understand that the following are the names of the committee appointed to consider and report on the suggestions made by Mr. Tayler and his friends:—Revds. R. B. Aspland, Charles Beard, P. W. Clayden, J. Gordon, E. Higginson, B. Herford, H. Ierson, W. James, W. A. Jones, E. Kell, J. Martineau, R. E. B. Maclellan, J. J. Tayler, J. H. Thom; Messrs. W. S. Cookson, E. Enfield, T. F. Gibson, J. Heywood, W. J. Lamport, J. Murch, H. New, S. Shaen, W. C. Venning, and Alderman J. C. Lawrence.

LONDON SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

The Annual Breakfast of this Society was held on Thursday morning, May 24th, at Radley's Hotel, Blackfriars, the Rev. W. James, of Bristol, occupied the Chair. The attendance was very numerous. After breakfast the Chairman introduced the business by some valuable remarks on the object of Sunday-Schools, and the good they were calculated to accomplish, and then called on the Secretary, Mr. I. M. Wade, to read the Annual Report. It stated that there are in England about three millions of Sunday Scholars and 300,000 teachers,—yet, vast as their numbers are, it

is doubtful whether Sunday-School instruction is now making much way. The numbers in the Schools connected with the Association are less, and the average attendance not so good, either of teachers or scholars. This was partly accounted for by the increase of day and evening Schools, the long hours of week-day labour, and perhaps by the fact, that the Sunday-School had not kept pace with the mental progress and the requirements of the age. In Manchester and Salford it appeared that considerably more than half the population, between the ages of three and fifteen attended no School whatever. Our branch of the Christian Church contributed about 21,000 scholars, and 3,500 teachers. In regard to providing a new set of books, it was stated that the Committee have before them the outline schemes of two books intended for younger children; and another outline had also been approved of a work suitable to children of eight to twelve years. Other manuscripts are before the Committee for consideration. A little book published in America, called "Sunday Lessons for young children," will probably soon be re-printed by the Committee. The Rev. J. Martineau moved, and Sir J. Bowring seconded the adoption of the Report. Miss Nash, of Royston, a lady eighty-four years of age, made a few observations of encouragement. Some remarks were also made by the Rev. T. Hincks, of Leeds, and Mr. Herbert New. The Rev. H. Crosskey proposed, and Mr. Freeman, of Norwich, seconded a welcome to the several representatives of kindred Societies who were present. The Rev. J. D. Smyth, of Norwich, the Rev. J. J. Tayler, the Rev. J. C. Street, the Rev. B. Herford, Mr. Riley, of the North Midland Association, and Mr. Turner, from Sydney, Australia, also spoke. The proceedings terminated with a cordial vote of thanks to the Chairman.

THE IRISH UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN SOCIETY.

The Anniversary Sermons of this Society were preached in the Unitarian Church, Stephen's Green, Dublin, on Sunday, June 10, by the Rev. J. C. Street, of Newcastle-on-Tyne. The attendance both at morning and evening service was good; and the eloquent discourses of the preacher, in which he exhibited the value of enlightened and liberal views of Christian truth, were listened to with marked attention.

On Tuesday evening, June 12, the annual Soiree was held in the School-rooms connected with the Church, which were beautifully decorated for the occasion. After tea the chair was taken by Dr. Kidd, who addressed the meeting at considerable length. He then called on the Secretary, the Rev. G. A. Armstrong, to read the Report of the Committee for the past year. The Rev. Gentleman, before reading the report, dwelt on the benefits which the Society was calculated to produce, and stated that from various quarters he had received applications for books and tracts. Mr. James Haughton moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Street for the admirable sermons which he had preached on Sunday in behalf of the Society, and urged the duty of making continued efforts to disseminate the views of Christian doctrine and duty which they believed to be true and valuable. Mr. Street responded in an

eloquent speech, in which he dwelt on the importance of a liberal religious education, and then went on to say that he would not be satisfied to know that liberal opinions were beginning to leaven other churches. That was all very well; but he would like to see members enrolling themselves under the banner of Unitarian Christianity. A vote of thanks was then passed to the chairman, and the meeting separated.

REMONSTRANT SYNOD OF ULSTER.

The Annual Meeting of this Body was held in the First Meeting-house, Rosemary Street, Belfast, on Tuesday, June 19. The outgoing Moderator, the Rev. W. Napier, of Ballymoney, preached from Eccl. ix. 10, and afterwards constituted the Synod by prayer. The Rev. John Porter, Ballee, was unanimously elected Moderator for the ensuing year. The reports of the several presbyteries were handed in, and read by the Clerk. A committee was then appointed to prepare a resolution on the death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery. The Clerk read a letter from the Rev. J. A. Crozier, resigning the office of Treasurer of the Synod, on account of his change of residence, and the Rev. R. Campbell was appointed in his stead.

The Rev. John Orr, after the Clerk had read the report on a Synodical Library, presented at last meeting of Synod, rose to move that the other constituent bodies of the Non-Subscribing Association be invited to co-operate with the Synod in forming a library adequate for the necessities of the Irish Non-Subscribing Churches. He remarked that a good library was indispensable to their usefulness as ministers; they should be thoroughly educated men, versed in the intelligence of the age, and able to present their views to an intelligent laity. He could see no objection to their asking the other bodies connected with the Non-Subscribing Association to join them. It was the characteristic of their Church that they were large and liberal in their sympathies, and non-sectarian. A man might be a Calvinist, an Arminian, or even a Quaker, and, if he repudiates human standards and confessions of faith, he might become a minister of their Body. If it was said there were differences among them, he believed that, theologically, there were none, or almost none; and if there were certain unfortunate personal animosities, which separated man from man, he did not think they were at all such as could interfere in a case of this kind, which might have the effect of making them agree as brethren. The Rev. A. Lunn seconded the motion. The Rev. J. Montgomery thought they were not likely to co-operate. He appealed to Mr. Orr whether, when they had waited on the Committee of the Association some time ago, on a matter dear to them all, there was that harmony which should have prevailed. He left that meeting more distressed than ever he had left a meeting before. Several ministers having spoken on the subject, the motion was passed unanimously. The increase and education of students for the ministry having been considered, the Synod adjourned. At a subsequent *sederunt* the following resolution was submitted and passed unanimously, in reference to the

death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery:—"At this, the first meeting of the Remonstrant Synod since the death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, we desire to express and to record our sense of the great loss the Synod has sustained in his removal, our veneration for his memory, our recognition of the many high qualities that adorned his character, and our appreciation of the great services he rendered to the cause of civil and religious liberty, and to that of rational Christianity, by contributing so effectually to the foundation of our Remonstrant Church; and we sympathise sincerely with the afflicted widow and family, and pray God to strengthen them with the strength that religion alone can give."

IRISH NON-SUBSCRIBING PRESBYTERIAN ASSOCIATION.

On Wednesday, June 20, a General Meeting of this Association was held in the Second Meeting-house, Rosemary Street, Belfast. The President, the Rev. J. Scott Porter, preached from Isa. lv. 10, 11, and then constituted the Meeting by prayer. The Rev. W. Whitelegge, of Cork, was unanimously appointed President. The Secretary, the Rev. Hugh Moore, then proceeded to read the Minutes of the last General Meeting. It appeared that in reference to certain objectionable passages in those Minutes, the Rev. J. S. Porter had given notice of motion that they should be expunged. On this matter there was considerable discussion, but the Secretary having stated that he did not mean, by the expressions objected to, to impute any irregularity to Mr. Porter, a resolution embodying such assurance from the Secretary was adopted, and Mr. Porter expressed himself satisfied. In reference to a protest which, for himself and others, the Rev. S. C. Nelson had give notice of against the election of Mr. Porter as President at the Banbridge meeting, he begged to abandon it, and said that, whatever were the grounds of that protest, he had no unpleasant feeling in his mind towards Mr. Porter, with whom certainly he had differed ecclesiastically, but not, he believed, theologically. Although they might look on Mr. Porter as a sort of an Adullamite—— Mr. Porter here rose and appealed to the President against the use of such offensive terms. Mr. Nelson said that he did not use it in an offensive sense. Mr. Porter said he would acquiesce in the withdrawal of Mr. Nelson's protest, as he said he no longer abided by the views he had come to on the subject. The Rev. H. Moore was re-elected Secretary, and Mr. Michael Andrews was re-appointed Treasurer. It was agreed that the General Meetings of the Association shall hereafter be as they were originally, triennial, the next Meeting to be held in Belfast, in June, 1869. On the subject of Ministerial Support a Committee was appointed, and a resolution was passed agreeing to co-operate for the establishment of a Library, mainly theological. On the motion of Mr. Nelson, it was agreed that the examination of Students be henceforth conducted in public, and that at the close of each session an address be delivered by the President, or some one deputed by him. The Rev. James Orr brought forward a series of resolutions on the subject of national and collegiate education, which was referred to the General Purposes Committee.

NORTHERN SUNDAY SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The Annual Meeting of this Association was held in the Mission House, Stanhope Street, Belfast, on Tuesday evening, June 19. The chair was occupied by J. M. Darbishire, Esq., who, after the meeting had been opened with prayer, referred to the operations of the Association, and also to the Teachers' Union; and then, in the absence of the Secretary, the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, he called on the Rev. T. Bowring to read the Report. It dwelt on the advantages which the Association afforded to the Schools connected with it, and detailed its operations during the past year. Mr. Hartley submitted the Treasurer's Account, which, with the Report, was adopted and ordered to be printed. A resolution on the value of the Sunday School was introduced by the Rev. D. Thomson, who said he thought there was a want of real earnestness among the Non-Subscribing Churches on the subject of Sunday Schools. This resolution was seconded by Mr. W. H. Greer. The Rev. J. S. Porter, in an eloquent speech, moved a resolution expressing sympathy with kindred Societies in England, which was seconded by Mr. W. H. Greer; and the Rev. R. Cleland moved a vote of thanks to the Hibernian Bible Society, which was seconded by the Rev. J. Jellie. A Committee for the next year was then appointed.

The Report of the Teachers' Union, which was of a very satisfactory kind, was read by the Secretary, Mr. Jellie, and the Chairman then announced the subject for discussion: "How shall we interest children in the Sunday-School?" Mr. Jellie read two admirable papers contributed by ladies. After the reading of these it was found that it was too late to discuss the question, or consider the important suggestions embodied in the papers, and, on the motion of the Rev. T. Bowring, it was agreed to adjourn the meeting, the time of next meeting to be determined by the Committee and duly announced. The Rev. J. S. Porter was moved to the second chair, and a well-deserved vote of thanks to Mr. Darbishire was carried by acclamation.

OBITUARY.

Died, on May 15, at Louisville, Kentucky, aged 74 years, the Rev. Theodore Clapp, for many years minister of the largest and wealthiest congregation in New Orleans.

Died, on June 1, at Newtownards, Mr. Samuel Kennedy, aged 94 years.

To Correspondents.—"The First Miracle," "Christ our Brother," and Letter of Rev. R. Spears, held over for want of space.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] AUGUST, 1866. [No. 7.

AN UNSECTARIAN THEOLOGY.

OF the whims and fancies that have latterly prevailed among a certain class of religionists, none has obtained more prominence than that of "an Unsectarian Theology." What it exactly means it would be difficult for its most enthusiastic advocates to define; and, in truth, another of the prevalent fashions is, to define nothing. But we presume that those who plead for it, flatter themselves that it is quite practicable to drop the distinctive names by which sects and parties have been designated, to ignore all the differences which have separated inquirers after theological truth, and blend the several sects and schools into one harmonious whole. Such, no doubt, they suppose to be the real unity which the Gospel of Christ recommends, and which Dr. Samuel Clarke has described as, "not a unity of opinion in the bond of ignorance, or a unity of practice in the bond of hypocrisy, but the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." And in such an expectation, many of the most liberal among our ministers and laymen would teach us that religious differences are of little moment; most naturally they sigh for an end of all theological strife; and they imagine that, in this dream of "an Unsectarian Theology," they have discovered a panacea for the interminable controversies that have raged in Christendom—a means of restoring the Church to that healthy condition which some fancy that they see typified in the seamless garment of our Lord.

But what are we to understand by an "Unsectarian Theology?" for, to appreciate its value, we must comprehend its meaning. Theology, according to one lexicographer, is "the science which instructs us in the knowledge of God and divine things, or which has God, and

the things which he has revealed, for its object;" or "a science which shews us what we are to believe of God, and the manner in which he should be served." And by another it is defined as "the science which treats of the existence, nature, and attributes of God, his laws and government, the doctrines to be believed, and the duties to be practised." Now let us take one of these definitions, or any other which may be fairly given, and it is evident that Theology embraces a variety of matters on which honest inquirers have arrived at very different conclusions. Some have sought out God in creation, providence, and the human soul, rejecting, for reasons which satisfy themselves, the revelation which is embodied in the Sacred Scriptures; and, limiting their inquiry to these, which may be termed the natural manifestations of God, they have arrived at conflicting conclusions respecting his being, attributes, and will, and thus they might be divided into separate schools; but, considering them in reference to those who accept the Scriptures as containing a Revelation of God, they have been classed as one sect, under the general name of *Deists*. Deists, thus, are a theological sect.

But the majority of theologians in these lands accept the Revelation which God gave by Jesus Christ, and, from the study of it, additional and most important light is thrown on the character and the unity of God, on "the doctrines to be believed and the duties to be practised." But from a careful and, we doubt not, an honest examination of the Scriptures, some have arrived at the belief that God subsists in three persons, each perfect God; and some have reached the conclusion that Revelation, equally with nature, exhibits God as subsisting only in one person. Here, then, are two additional theological sects which we may call, as they have been called, Trinitarian Christians, and Unitarian Christians. Again, among Trinitarians and others, there has been a difference of opinion respecting the freedom of the human will and the foreknowledge of the Deity, which has separated them into two great divisions, commonly known as Arminians and Calvinists, which thus form two distinct theological sects. And, not to refer to many other points on which theologians have differed; and not to notice the various

ecclesiastical views which have produced divisions and sub-divisions, we think it is plain enough that there are, and, so far as we see, there must be, theological sects, and therefore sectarian theology: and an "Unsectarian Theology" is only the dream of well-meaning, but hazy and perplexed divines, who hope in such a tomb to bury all doubts and differences.

What would we think of some enthusiastic patriots who would propound a new system of politics, which should extinguish every party name, and unite in one organization Conservative and Radical, Whig and Tory, under the attractive title of "no party" politicians? The Conservative should be Conservative still; so should Whig, and Tory, and Radical hold by their principles; but they should regard them as unimportant matters—hold them, but not speak them,—in order that conflicting views should be kept in abeyance. Such a system might live long enough in the mind of the dreamy sentimentalist, but in the battle of life it could not exist for a day. We remember having heard of a "no party" gentleman who contested an Irish borough some years ago; and when he waited on the electors, and was asked his views of this question or the other which at that time occupied the mind of intelligent politicians, his uniform reply was—"Much might be said on both sides." We need scarcely add that he was the unsuccessful candidate. It is right that men should hold and advocate whatever political views they think most conducive to the stability and prosperity of the state; and a suppression of these views on the part of the intelligent and educated classes would be a serious detriment to the country. So on the interesting subject of theology it is right that men should think and inquire, and hold by the opinions which seem to them true; and it would neither be good for themselves, nor for the cause of truth, that they should suppress these, or throw them into a common fund of opinion, labelled—"Unsectarian Theology."

Let us imagine, if we can, a professor of "Unsectarian Theology" occupying a chair in one of our colleges, and lecturing on "God—his nature and attributes—his laws and government—the doctrines to be believed and the duties to be practised." He would, of course, dwell on

God's unity, but he would teach his pupils that the best men have differed on this subject; and, while some think Him to be only one, many believe that He is three, and it is right for them therefore to regard this as an "open question." He would touch on the subject of Free-will, and inform his students that while many hold that man has freedom of will, many also are of opinion that all are obedient to the eternal decrees of God, and are, from their birth, predestinated to a certain end. This point, too, he would exhort them to leave an "open question." Many, he would tell them, think that the Son of God was supernaturally sent to teach and save the world; that by the presence and power of his Father he wrought miracles; and that, when the Jews crucified him, he was raised from the dead, and appeared again to his disciples, permitting them to feel his hands and his feet in order to satisfy them of the reality of his resurrection. But he would add, that others regard the Gospel narratives as fabulous or false, look upon Jesus as a Jew distinguished merely by his amiable disposition and his great intelligence, and that the story of his resurrection was only a superstitious tale; and perhaps he might add that a few others think there is something in this legend of the resurrection, and that, possibly, the *Ghost* of Jesus appeared to his disciples: but he would, of course, add, that these are difficult questions, which some of the foremost thinkers of the age have regarded as of little importance, and would urge, that the great point for them to dwell on is the spirit and the life of Christ; and in the genuine unsectarian spirit he might add—"Much may be said on both sides."

We think it must be obvious to all who have not been led away by the platitudes and plausibilities of a fashionable liberalism, that an "Unsectarian Theology" is an utter impossibility—an illusion which experience must speedily dissipate. There is, indeed, a sense in which our theological views may be "unsectarian"—they may be free from the harsh and illiberal spirit which diversities of opinion too frequently engender; and for this we would heartily strive. The most sincere Christians, the most intelligent and honest men, have, on many questions, arrived at different conclusions; let them hold their con-

clusions in a spirit of meekness and humility, feeling that they are frail and fallible; and let them not bring charges of bigotry and intolerance against those who dissent from their opinions, and therefore decline to unite with them in church membership, and in efforts for the spread of religious knowledge. Christians who believe that the Father is the only God cannot, without violating conscience, join with their brethren, however intelligent and exemplary, in worshipping Christ as God; and those who believe that God has given us a Revelation by Jesus Christ, cannot join in a church organization with those, however gifted or benevolent, who reject revealed, and accept only natural religion. But amid these diversities of opinion, there may be a real unity of spirit. The various sects may lay aside their dogmatism and virulence, which are no part of religion, natural or revealed, and may cherish towards each other sentiments of meekness and forbearance. Thus we may have, in the best, and, indeed, in the only practicable or intelligible sense, *unsectarian theologians.*

THE HOLIER WORSHIP.

Oh, he whom Jesus loved hath truly spoken!
The holier worship, which God deigns to bless,
Restores the lost, and heals the spirit broken,
And feeds the widow and the fatherless.

Then, brother man, fold to thy heart thy brother!
For where love dwells, the peace of God is there;
To worship rightly is to love each other;
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer.

Follow, with reverent steps, the great example
Of him whose holy work was—doing good;
So shall the wide earth seem our Father's temple,
Each loving life a psalm of gratitude.

Thus shall all shackles fall; the stormy clangor
Of wild war music o'er the earth shall cease;
Love shall tread out the hateful fires of anger,
And in its ashes plant the tree of peace.—Whittier.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 192.)

Between Mr. Read's settlement at Glenarm, in 1756, and his retirement from the active duties of the ministry, in 1792, eight visitations of his Congregation were held by the Presbytery of Templepatrick. Of the first of these visitations,—that which was held in 1759,—the full record, as it appears in the minutes of the Templepatrick Presbytery, has been quoted in my last paper. Of the remainder I must now endeavour to give a brief account.

The second visitation of Glenarm, during Mr. Read's ministry there, was held on April 25, 1769. It was attended by Mr. Robert Montgomery as Elder, who, with Mr. John M'Collum, also acted as Commissioner from the Congregation. The account which the Presbytery received of the conduct of the minister, elders, and people of Glenarm was, on the whole, satisfactory; the only exception being that Mr. John Davidson, who appeared as head collector of stipend, presented to the Presbytery a paper shewing "that the Congregation of Glenarm, at the 1st of February last past, owed their minister £92 2s. 2d. The Presbytery, greatly concerned to find such a large arrear due by the people of Glenarm, ordered Mr. Rogers to write a letter, and leave it to be read to that Congregation next Lord's day, wherein he is to urge the managers and heads of families in the Congregation to meet as soon as they conveniently can, and form some plan for lessening the above arrear, and doing justice to Mr. Read as speedily as possible."

Three years after giving this recommendation, viz., on June 9, 1772, the Presbytery of Templepatrick held another visitation of the Congregation with which we are now concerned.* On this occasion, Messrs. John

* Shortly before this time,—viz., July 4, 1771,—Glenarm had been favoured with the presence of another clerical visitant, Rev. John Wesley, who, in his Journal, gives the following account of the visit which he then paid to Glenarm, as well as of the characteristic manner in which Methodism was first introduced into that town and neighbourhood:—"1771, Thursday, *July* 4.—From Larne I rode to Glen-

M'Collum and Robert Montgomery appeared as Commissioners from the Session, and Messrs. Joseph Hunter and John Wharry as Commissioners from the Congregation of Glenarm. They concurred in giving to the Presbytery a very favourable account of the manner in which Mr. Read discharged the duties of his office. The Commissioners from the Congregation also gave a similar account of the Session of Glenarm; but when Mr. Read was asked "if the people of his Congregation gave regular and due attendance upon public worship, he, with great concern, complained that some were very culpable in not attending upon public worship. The Session of Glenarm were instructed by the Presbytery to admonish these people, and point out to them the criminality of their conduct; and if they be not influenced by these admonitions to give regular attendance in time to come, they are to be treated as disorderly members, and not allowed the privileges of their society." A copy of this minute was ordered to be left with Mr. Read, and by him to be read to his people on next Lord's day. As to pecuniary matters between Mr. Read and his Congregation, an account signed by that gentleman, and by Messrs. John M'Collum, Robert Montgomery, Andrew Holmes, and John Wharry, was produced, whereby it appeared that at May 1, 1772, the Congregation of Glenarm were indebted to their minister the sum of £56 7s. 3d. The Commissioners being asked if they had formed any plan for

arm. The preaching began here in an uncommon manner. Some months since, John Smith, now with God, was pressed in spirit to go and preach there, though he knew no one in the town. Near it he overtook a young lady riding behind a servant, and on her saying it was a very wicked place, he asked—are there no good men there? She said, yes, there is one, William Hunter. He rode into the town, and enquired for William Hunter's house. When he came to the door, a young woman was sweeping the house. He asked her name, and being answered, 'Betty Hunter,' alighted, and said, 'Betty, take my horse to an inn, and tell every one you meet, a gentleman at our house has got good news to tell you at seven o'clock.' At seven the house was well filled. John preached to them twice a day, for nine days, but when he took his leave he had only threepence. However, he asked the landlady, what is to pay for my horse? Nothing, Sir, said the woman; a gentleman has paid all, and will do, if you stop a month. I preached near the Market-house, about noon, to a large number of decent hearers."—(*Journal of Rev. John Wesley, at date*). A memoir in the Ordnance Survey of Londonderry, states that a Methodist Society is reported to have been formed in Glenarm about 1768.

the payment of the above arrear, "a scheme was read, proposing that if the general bondsmen," (*i.e.*, those who had bound themselves at Mr. Read's ordination for the payment to him of £40 per annum), would "applot the above arrear upon themselves, according to their several abilities, and pay it off, the general bond would be given up, provided twenty men would perfect separate bonds each for forty shillings a year, (thus, making up the promised £40). This scheme was agreed to, as the Commissioners informed the Presbytery, by several of the general bondsmen, and by others it was opposed. The Presbytery were of opinion that the above scheme ought to be adopted, and that all well-minded people, who had a regard to the welfare and public credit of their congregation should join with the bondsmen, according to their abilities, in assisting to pay up said arrear." Upon this subject a long memorandum, dated Glenarm, November 30, 1772, is appended to the minutes of the Templepatrick Presbytery. From this memorandum it appears that the arrear of £59 due to Mr. Read at May, 1772, was liquidated by subscription, towards which Robert Montgomery contributed 8 guineas, Andrew Holmes, 5 guineas, John M'Collum, 5 guineas, Robert Currell, 5 guineas, William Clark, 5 guineas, James Currell, 5 guineas, Daniel Doak, 3 guineas, Alex. M'Mullan, 3 guineas, Mrs. M'Master, 1 guinea. Sundry small subscriptions, the balance.

As to the future, twenty persons, whose names are hereinafter mentioned, perfected bonds to Mr. Read for forty shillings a-year each, in place of the general bond for £40, which had been given to him on the day of his ordination. This general bond he now surrendered, "pledging himself, at the same time, to give any security in his power, that those who comply, and pay the sums annexed to their several names, shall never be called upon by him for the payment of any part of said arrear of £59; and that he will also indemnify them of any expenses that they might be liable to by a prosecution against such as may refuse to pay what is applotted upon them, if any such there be." These "particular bondsmen" (as they were called) for forty shillings a-year each, were further "to have for their security, and to

enable them to pay the sums annexed to their names, as many seats as with their annual stipend will make up the sum for which each of them is to engage, and bonds to be given by every individual to these bondsmen;" so that in this way the whole congregation was bound in some form or other. Twenty of them were bound directly to the minister for forty shillings a-year each, and each of the remaining seatholders was again bound to some one of the twenty bondsmen for the amount of his individual stipend. The scheme was ingenious and elaborate, but it did not, apparently, work well, as we shall see in the sequel. The names of the twenty bondsmen for forty shillings a-year each were, Robert Montgomery, David Holmes, Alex. Hunter, William Clark, Neal M'Killup, John Doak, John Wharry, Andrew Dunn, Hugh Watt, Alexander Hunter, James Currell, Daniel Currell, John M'Collum, James Morrow, William Morrow, Geo. Au. Eaton, Joseph M'Killup, James Lawry, Hugh Pennell, and Alexander Stewart.

Only two years after the concoction of the foregoing scheme, another Visitation Presbytery was held at Glenarm, viz., on May 3, 1774. On this occasion the congregation, whose memoir I am now writing, did not appear to advantage. Indeed it can scarcely be said to have appeared at all.

"Although the Presbytery were informed that the Congregation of Glenarm had been duly advised that they would be visited, as this day, and although Mr. Read reported that he had requested the Session and Congregation, last Lord's Day, to appoint Commissioners to attend the Presbytery this day, yet, to the Presbytery's great surprise and concern, not one person appeared to represent either the Session or Congregation of Glenarm; nor did more than three or four of that people attend to hear the sermon and join with the Presbytery in public worship. The Presbytery were greatly surprised at the conduct of the people of Glenarm, and deeply affected with the treatment which they met with, many of them having attended from a distance, out of respect to Mr. Read and his Congregation; and yet that that people should treat them in such a manner as discovers a contempt of Presbytery not known by the oldest member, and of which there is not perhaps an instance parallel to it in their entire records. A member of Presbytery was appointed to exchange pulpits with Mr. Read on next Lord's Day, to read this minute to the Congregation of Glenarm, and inform them that the Presbytery are at a loss to know what reason they can have to assign for their behaviour, and inquire if they can shew that the Presbytery ever merited such con-

tempt as the Congregation of Glenarm have this day discovered to them, and that the Presbytery expect that they will send a Commissioner to next meeting at Antrim, and show cause, if any they have, for such behaviour, and also send by that Commissioner a stated account between Mr. Read and them."

The minutes of the next meeting of Presbytery, June 28, 1774, do not record the attendance of any such Commissioner from Glenarm, nor do they contain any reference to the affairs of that congregation.

Six years elapsed before the Presbytery held another visitation meeting in Glenarm. On August 1, 1780, they again assembled there to make those inquiries into the spiritual and temporal condition of that congregation which their Presbyterial duty required them to do; and I am sorry to add, that notwithstanding the touching remonstrance above recorded, the reception which, on this occasion, the Presbytery met with from the people of Glenarm, was just as disrespectful as it had been on the previous occasion. The minute of Presbytery referring to this second and aggravated instance of contempt of court, is so simply plaintive, that I am tempted to quote it in full.

"Glenarm, *August* 1, 1780 (Six Ministers present).—There was no preacher appointed to open this meeting, as there was no Congregation to preach to, though public intimation had been given that the Presbytery would visit the Congregation of Glenarm on this day. The Presbytery were astonished and affected with real concern upon attending here this day, to find that there were not more than four or five of that Congregation appeared. The Presbytery inquired if Commissioners from the Session and Congregation had been appointed to attend, and it appeared that none were appointed, though they were repeatedly requested to do it. This conduct in that people, the Presbytery think, is marked with the most evident signature of disrespect to them as a Presbytery, and want of real regard to the Presbyterian interest, as it is a standing rule in the Presbyterian Church, that every Congregation of which a particular Presbytery has charge, is to be visited by said Presbytery in due time, or as soon as may be convenient, and to be informed by Commissioners or representatives of said Congregation, how matters stand between their Minister and them, that the Presbytery may contribute what may be in their power to preserve peace and good order among them. However utterly inattentive they may have been to these important purposes, the Congregation of Glenarm must feel the just censure and reproaches of their own hearts, as acting quite out of character as Presbyterians. The Presbytery, therefore, ordered their clerk

to bear testimony against this disrespectful behaviour of the Congregation of Glenarm, by giving them a copy of this minute to be read publicly in the meeting-house.

The Presbytery, however, called upon the few persons who were present to answer the questions which are usually put by a Visitation Presbytery, and Mr. John M'Collum, as a member of Session, and Messrs. James Currell, and James Currell, jun., as members of the Congregation, gave replies respecting the Minister and Session of Glenarm, which were very agreeable to the Presbytery. But when Mr. Read was asked how his Congregation at large attended public worship, and other means of public instruction and edification, he answered, "while several of them were very regular and punctual in their attendance, others are shamefully culpable in that respect, and particularly, that the generality of the people could not be induced to attend catechizing. The Presbytery, sorry to hear these complaints, sincerely wished and prayed that all people under their care might be happily disposed to make a suitable improvement of the privileges they enjoyed, and not to contemn and despise them, lest they be found amongst those who will not be able to stand in the judgment." The report as to the conduct of the Congregation towards their Minister in things temporal, was as bad as in things spiritual. An account, attested by Mr. Read, and by Messrs. John M'Collum, Andrew Dunne, and Neal M'Killup, stated that, upon August 1, 1780, the Congregation of Glenarm owed their Minister £134 11s. $0\frac{3}{4}$d. On this point the Presbytery could only express "their regret at finding the Congregation sunk into so heavy an arrear, and their wish that they should exert themselves to devise some method speedily to put an end to a state of affairs which must be very injurious to Mr. Read, and, if not prevented, would one day be very grievous to the Congregation.

The next Presbyterial Visitation of Glenarm, which was held on May 5, 1783, was in one respect more satisfactory than the preceding. There was no lack of Commissioners, either from the Session or the Congregation; the former being represented by Messrs. John M'Collum, Robert Montgomery, and Hugh Watt; the latter by Messrs. John Clarke, Christopher Dunne, Andrew Dunne,

Alexander Stewart, and Neal M'Killup. The report which all these persons gave of the conduct of the Minister and Session of Glenarm, was highly favourable and agreeable to the Presbytery. But when Mr. Read was asked how his congregation at large behaved under his ministry, he said (as on a previous occasion), that whilst a considerable number of them were very regular in their conduct, and in their attendance upon public worship and ordinances, "with heartfelt pain he was obliged to inform the Presbytery that not a few of his congregation absented themselves from public worship, and spent the Lord's day in a very indecent manner." This account was "very grevious to the Presbytery," who thereupon indited a homily respecting it, in the form of a minute, which they directed their clerk to transmit to the Congregation of Glenarm, but which did not, I fear, produce any great effect. The arrear of stipend due to Mr. Read by his people on May 1, 1783, was £125 9s. 11¼d.

The next Visitation of Glenarm, of which we have any record, was held by a Committee of the Templepatrick Presbytery, on September 1, 1789, and was attended by five ministers. In the minutes of this meeting no reference is made to the spiritual affairs of the congregation. The attention of the brethren seems to have been confined exclusively to its temporalities, which were not in a flourishing condition. On the first day of the previous month (viz., August 1, 1789), no less a sum than £207 5s. had been due to Mr. Read. Of this he had in the interval received in cash, and in "12 bolls of oats which were thought to be worth £9," the sum of £45 14s. 6½d; leaving a balance still chargeable against the congregation of £161 10s. 11½d.

In the Visitation of next year, which also was held by a Committee of Presbytery on August 31, 1790, this arrear had swollen to the sum of £179 8s. 1½d; and at a similar visitation which was held in Glenarm on August 22, 1791, it was reported that the debt due to Mr. Read on August 1, 1791, amounted on the whole to £204 14s. 1d.; "to which statement the Congregation were asked if they had any objections; and they said they had none."

Such being the state of affairs in Glenarm Congregation, we are not surprised to find that soon after the last-mentioned visitation, Mr. Read retired from the active duties of a ministry which, in his case, was so ill requited, and availed himself of the services of an assistant and successor. This step he took in 1792. He survived until 1812, enjoying a rest from labour of no less than twenty years. But as his name henceforth disappears from the history of the Glenarm Congregation, I may as well give here the few personal particulars which I have been able to collect respecting this minister. Mr. Read was minister of Glenarm in 1760, when the French landed near Carrickfergus. On this occasion he acted as ensign to Lord Antrim's Glenarm Regiment of Militia, whom he accompanied to the muster at Bella Hill, armed and in uniform, and also carrying the colours of the regiment. At a later period of his life, his loyalty was not so conspicuous, for during the course of the American war he got himself into serious trouble by speaking of King George III. as "an old fool;" an expression which, although perhaps it was not without some foundation in truth, was yet in those days held to savour of sedition. Mr. Read's personal appearance is remembered to the present day by some old people who are still living. He was a tall, venerable-looking old gentleman, and wore to the last the large wig and three-cocked hat which used to be considered indispensable parts of clerical costume. He married early in life, Martha, second daughter of Rev. W. Rogers, of Ballynure, who, however, was not long spared to him. She died on the 5th July, 1768, at the very early age of 22 years. Her husband, though he survived her 44 years, never married again, and never had any family. At length, on Dec. 31, 1812, and in the 92nd year of his age, he rejoined the wife of his youth. His mortal remains were laid in Glenarm churchyard, in the same grave which, nearly half a century previously, had received those of his beloved partner. An inscription on the tombstone, which serves as a common covering for the relics of the re-united couple, records the foregoing facts and dates. Mr. Read was a zealous Freemason, and was interred by the fraternity with full masonic honours. His funeral sermon

was preached by Brother Rev. Thomas Alexander, of Cairncastle.

Mr. Read, having no family of his own, adopted a nephew and namesake, Thomas Read, whom he reared and educated, and who lived with him till his death. Afterwards, this young man removed to Belfast, where he carried on business as a spirit merchant, and died several years ago. I presume it is from some connexion with this nephew—who, however, left no legitimate issue, that persons of the name of Read have lately been interred in the Minister's grave.

(*To be continued.*)

THE RISEN SAVIOUR.

Dr. Hedge, the Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Harvard University, says, in his work on "Reason in Religion," (I quote his very words) "Criticism has done its uttermost with the New Testament. What is now left standing is likely to stand; and what is it that is thus secured to us? Enough to substantiate to fair and rational criticism *the crowning fact of the Resurrection.*" I have read every word of the noble work from which this extract is taken, and though I would venture humbly to differ from some of the statements and conclusions it sets forth, I would nevertheless most earnestly recommend its perusal to my fellow Christians, especially those of them in our Unitarian Churches who fail, or seem to fail, to realize the truths which underlie some of the more popular forms and doctrines of orthodoxy.

In the account which the evangelist Matthew gives of the resurrection of Christ, he says (xxviii. 6), that the angel said unto the women who had come "in the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, to see the sepulchre," "He is not here; for he is risen, as he said, Come, see the place where the Lord lay." These words seem to me to affirm the resurrection of Christ, and that it had taken place in conformity with his own express prediction; while they invited the women, and, through them, ourselves, to see

and ponder upon that empty sepulchre. I have tried, for nearly twenty years past, for the satisfaction of my own mind, to obey the invitation of the angel, and I now wish to state, in brief and very simple terms, the reasons which have convinced me that Jesus Christ did literally and really rise from the dead.

Ever since the words of the angel have been given to the world, their truth has been disputed, partly because of the discrepancies between the four narratives which form the Gospels; partly because the very fact of, and belief in, immortality have been made to stand or fall in Christ's resurrection; and partly because belief in that resurrection does actually call upon us to believe in what may be termed a miracle. But now, apart from these objections and criticisms, let us try to see if there are any facts, and if so, what they are.

1. Jesus of Nazareth was apprehended, tried, and put to death by crucifixion. Strauss himself admits so much as this, while the history of the cross, considered as a symbol, would seem to imply it. Jesus did actually and really die, and not merely seem to die. His death was attested by the soldiers who came to break the legs of Jesus and his companions on the cross, and who, on finding that Jesus was already dead, refrained, in his case, from their work; by one of the soldiers who, with his spear, pierced his side, and from which there came forth blood and water; and, finally, by the testimony of the centurion who was questioned by Pilate, and who gave his evidence to the effect that Jesus was really dead. Jesus, after being taken down from the cross, was buried in a sepulchre borrowed from Joseph of Arimathea,—in a sepulchre which, up to that time, had been unused,—in a sepulchre hewn out of a rock,—in a sepulchre closed by a stone,—in a sepulchre guarded by Roman soldiers and sealed with a Roman seal. It will thus be seen that the body of Jesus was placed in the custody, and at the sole disposal of his enemies, not his friends.

2. And yet the disciples of Jesus said that he had risen from the dead; and they said this, not in some place at a great distance from where the death of Jesus took place, nor after a considerable time had elapsed, but in Jerusalem, and in a very few weeks after his death.

They said it who had not so much as expected his death, much less his rising again, and who were simply incredulous when first they were told that their Lord had risen.

3. It is, I believe, now generally admitted by all, except *extreme* unbelievers, that the disciples of Jesus did really believe in the resurrection of their Master when they asserted it, and therefore that they were not intentional deceivers, but at most themselves the victims of deception. Now one may admit, as a natural possibility, that *some* of the disciples might have deceived themselves into the belief that a resurrection had taken place when it had not; but is it credible that the *whole body* should have been the victims of self-deception? Is it not also in the highest degree probable, if he had not risen, that the authorities, in whose custody it was, would have produced the dead body, and so have put an end at once to all doubt on the subject?

4. It should be borne in mind that many of the disciples, and all the chief or leading ones, suffered for their maintenance of the statement that their Master had risen from the dead, and in doing so they suffered for what to them was not a mere opinion, but a fact. Consider, too, the depths of despair into which they had been plunged, first by the apprehension, then the condemnation, and finally the crucifixion of Christ; and, joined to this despair, the change of mind and feeling which came over them in a very few weeks after that crucifixion had taken place. Surely something of a most important and influential kind must have occurred in the interval to have wrought so great a change—a change, too, which was permanent and practical in its results. Now, unless the bare possibility of Christ's resurrection be absolutely denied, is there anything very irrational in supposing that this change to which I have alluded, and about the reality of which there is no dispute, even in the minds of those who deny the resurrection, should have originated in what the Gospels say it did: "He is not here; for he is risen, as he said?" I think not. I believe in the resurrection of Christ, because the laws of thought and reasoning oblige me to do so.

5. I suppose it will not be doubted that great numbers

of the Jews, including priests and rulers, believed in Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah, and incorporated with their belief a belief in a risen Christ. How came it to pass that these Jews, many of them holding high positions, and wielding great influence as Jews, and who were in circumstances to test the whole matter, avowed such a belief, if Jesus had not risen? Surely what satisfied them, considering who and what they were, might save us in these days, who believe in the resurrection of the Saviour, from the imputation of ignorance and superstition.

6. The testimony of the Apostle Paul to the resurrection of Christ is too important to be overlooked, and too definite to be set aside. About twenty years after it is said to have taken place, Paul visited the city of Corinth and there planted a Christian Church. Now, we are told in his First Epistle to that Church, the genuineness of which has never been called in question by any writer, ancient or modern, that the testimony he delivered was as follows (I quote from "Stanley on the Corinthians"):—"Now, brethren, I would have you know the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, and wherein ye stand, by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory with what word I preached the Gospel unto you, unless ye believed in vain. For I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received,—how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures,—and that he was buried,—and that he has been raised the third day, according to the Scriptures,—and that he was seen by Kephas, then by the twelve. After that he was seen by above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen by James—then by all the Apostles. But last of all, as by one born out of due time, he was seen by me also." Now, observe that this testimony was delivered to the Corinthian Church "first of all," that is, "first of all" in priority of time, or of importance. It is immaterial, for our present purpose, which. But this much *is* certain, that the testimony was given in open day, among a people of unquestionable intelligence and addicted to the freest inquiry; and that it was also given

at a time when, had it not been true, the apostle could have been proved to have been a false witness. And yet I ask for the evidence which substantiates his ever having been convicted of such false testimony?

7. It will not, I think, be doubted, that the principles and facts of Christ's teachings and life, *including the statement that he had risen from the dead*, had spread themselves throughout the principal portions of the then known world, in less than forty years from the time of the Saviour's death. Could such have been the fact, supposing the resurrection not to have taken place? Were there not ample opportunities of testing the statement as to the resurrection—and numbers of persons both able and willing to test it—or were the Christian believers of that day, and those to whom they appealed, masses of incredulous persons?

8. There is a day called "Sunday," "the Sabbath," and "the Lord's Day," which has been observed throughout all Christendom for now more than 1,800 years, a day called, by way of emphasis, "the *Lord's* Day," because it has been, and still is, associated in the minds of Christians with our Lord's resurrection. Is not the observance of this particular day, together with the added name which Christians have given to it, over and above that of the Sabbath, a kind of historical proof of the faith of the early Church, and that that Church founded itself and its day of rest upon the empty tomb of Jesus, who, as the angel said, "was not there, but had risen, as he said."

Now I do not, of course, pretend to say that these evidences are exhaustive of the subject, or that they must necessarily commend themselves to the acceptance of all the persons who may examine them. But I am bound to say that they are among the principal evidences which have satisfied my own mind that in believing in the resurrection of Christ, I am believing in a fact and not in a mere impression; while I think they are of such a kind as to save me from the charge of ignorance, or merely sentimental belief. If it be said, "Well, suppose we admit that Christ did rise from the dead, what of it? What importance is there in the fact, supposing it to be one?" I do not pretend to answer for any other man.

Let every man "prove all things," as far as he can, and "hold fast that," and that only, "which is" or seems to him to be "good," or true. In this matter, as in every other, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," remembering that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." But to *me*, the resurrection of Christ cannot be an "open question," however much it may be so to another. I dare not say, as some have said, and do still say, that there is *no* assured ground upon which a belief in immortality may be built apart from the resurrection of Christ; but I do say that that resurrection brings the evidences for immortality down to the level of the senses, and to just that point where the soul is oftentimes the most perplexed. Our faith is not at all times equally strong, while the senses will ever and anon disturb and play sad havoc with it. We stand by the bedside of one who is to us as dear as any mortal being can be; and we stretch out our weak and eager hands, in our vain efforts to keep on this side the grave the being who is fast slipping away from them. At last the death-sweat comes, the death pallor overspreads the features, the breath becomes shorter and shorter, a strange gurgling sound is heard in the throat, there is a kind of gasp, the eyes close, and it is all over! We draw-to the curtains, and draw down the blinds, and stretch out the dead body of our beloved one, decently and reverently composing each separate limb. The house and its inmates are hushed to an unwonted stillness. At length the dead body is placed in the coffin, and the lid is fastened down which shuts out from our bodily view the form never so precious in our eyes as then. The mourners go through the streets, and the coffin is lowered into the grave, while "dust to dust, ashes to ashes, earth to earth," is said, as the clods of the valley rattle upon the coffin lid. We take one last, long, tearful look down into the depths of that grave, and the question will sometimes—I do not say always, but sometimes—arise in our minds, as it did to the mind of Job: "If a man die shall he live again?" And what are we to say? It is not all darkness; but, to use freely the words of another,* there is just enough of light to make the darkness painfully felt, but not always enough to create and

* Robertson's Sermons, Vol. ii., p. 307.

cherish the certainty which faith must always continue to ask. And it is at such times that the old words revive themselves in the memory, and the old belief asserts its power, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." "Because I live, ye shall live also." "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, has begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay." "Behold a man raised up by God." In that resurrection I see the distrust created by the senses, met and overcome by a fact in the realm of the senses. I see the prophecy of Christ, that he would rise from the dead, fulfilled, and the seal of God's approval of all that Christ said, and did, and was. I have no desire to add any more, save the words of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, who concludes his triumphal hymn of the resurrection with—"Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

FREDERICK ROWLAND YOUNG.

NEW SWINDON.

WHITHER ARE WE TENDING?

[The following article, by the Rev. T. Cromwell, Ph. D., was addressed in the form of a letter to *The London Inquirer*, but that journal suppressed the latter part of it, on the ground that the writer "attempts to fasten on his opponents a designation which they would utterly repudiate." It is remarkable that the scruples of *The Inquirer* are all on one side. Opprobrious designations, abusive epithets, and ungenerous attacks against those who differ from it, have free expression in its columns, while they are closed against just and fair criticism on the part of others. To represent certain principles which have latterly been advocated under the Unitarian name as "Transcendental Deism," which means, we suppose, *Deism in a mist*, can surely not be wrong, if such be the

honest opinion of the writer. To stifle such criticism is to violate the very principle of "free thought," for which *The Inquirer* and some of its correspondents are perpetually pleading.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

This is a revolutionary age in religion, and even we, staid Unitarians as we thought ourselves, are caught up in the whirl. Many causes are operative to changes in religion; the chief of them, no doubt, being a general increase of knowledge. But great changes also have been induced by certain phases of *philosophy;* and, however unconscious some of us may be of the fact, the basis of the change to which Unitarianism is now being subjected is *philosophic*. It becomes important, then, to ask if the philosophy in our case be SOUND, which I am prepared to deny; and I would append my opinion, that its mode of procedure, though it has proved too seductive, is little worthy of the great leaders who are revolutionizing *us* by their talents and their eloquence.

When the philosophically inclined among the early Christians sought to make the new religion harmonize with their turn of thought, they introduced, from Platonism and Orientalism, certain dogmas, from which the doctrine of the Trinity, and nearly the whole train of speculative errors that now deform the Church of Christ, have sprung. One thing, however, they did *not* do. Though to be called a Christian in those days, was to invite an amount of obloquy far exceeding that which follows from being called a Unitarian now, those philosophizing Christians fearlessly avowed that they *were* Christians, and only sought to make what they considered would be improvements in Christianity. But what is the course pursued by *our* philosophers? They would drop the name of Unitarian; they tell us that the time for Unitarianism has gone by; and they offer, for the name and the religion which I, a convert from Orthodoxy, most truly venerate, a *nameless something*, of which many will agree with me to say that it nearly empties Christianity of specific teaching, is intangible to most ordinary minds, and is rather admired than understood by the great majority of those who think the understand it. It were far nobler, more straightforward, more English, it seems to me, to take the advice of my honoured friend,

Mr. Sharpe, who says, "You have got the name; try to make it honourable, instead of trying to change it;" adding, "we have the important work now of persuading people, not to *change* their opinions, but to *own* them."

But I denied the SOUNDNESS of the philosophy which is at the bottom of our Unitarian change, and I must give my reasons for the denial.

In the first place, it is of the class of philosophies which have always built themselves upon *assumed principles* rather than *ascertained facts;* the class which, doubtless, in the course of ages, has made some valuable guesses, the worth of which, however, could only appear when the facts appeared which verified them. It has been said that, in philosophy, there are "born Platonists" and "born Aristotelians.' Well, certainly, our leaders are not "born Aristotelians." With much Platonic power, they sadly lack the lucidity, the inductiveness, and, I even venture to add, the profundity of Aristotle. They are of the Scotch and German metaphysical schools; schools of "the science of things that cannot be known;" schools for the cultivation in the pupils of "a preference, at first for notions over facts, and next for words over notions;" schools unparalleled for their success in instituting wonderful "gymnastics of the mind," and teaching the agility required for the performance of them. But they are not of the truly English school which ascends from facts to principles, instead of laying down principles and leaving the facts to find themselves. On the exact contrary, our leaders themselves take up as indisputable truths philosophical positions, substantiation of which, as truths, must be naturally impossible; such as that there are "intuitive ideas," and "original beliefs," "not founded on experience." How could we ever *know* that to be the case, supposing it were really so? On the other hand, every example given of these so-called "intuitive ideas" and "original beliefs" can be traced, inductively, to mental processes strictly "founded on experience." I maintain this even in relation to the idea of GOD, though only because in that instance the philosophy is most nearly connected with the present subject,—*our* religion most peculiarly springing out of healthily acquired notions of the Creator,— and because it (the philosophy) affirms

that the idea of God can be logically arrived at only by its "method." But what says Common Sense, arguing inductively from its "experience" of a universe around, every part of which is plainly a part of a grand system of things, *designed* for the accomplishment of each object which each part actually accomplishes? Why, it repeats that "argument from design" so well worn that I need not reiterate it, but which is quite looked down upon by the most modern metaphysical philosophy. And so Sir William Hamilton scrupled not to say, "It is *only* on the hypothesis of a soul within us,"—meaning the only description of "soul" accepted by him,—"that we can assert the reality of a God above us: we must recognize a God from our own minds, before we *detect* a God in nature." Now,—as it can be no breach of "order" in me to say, since I refer to speeches on occasions when many ministerial brethren were present with myself,—having heard these same sentiments, though not so flagrantly expressed, from the lips of our leaders also, it becomes, I confess, a very serious question with me, whether we ought to commit to philosophers, thus recognizing a God from nothing but their own opinion of the nature of their own minds, the construction for us of a *new religion*, not bearing the Unitarian name, and which is in the clouds at present, for anything that I, and many with me, can comprehend concerning it.

It is with no mere desire to speak of my own labours, that I here recal attention to my work on "The Soul and the Future Life" for a refutation more at large of the metaphysical subtleties which so needlessly trouble themselves, and those entering into them, about imaginary "intuitive ideas" and "original beliefs." I mention that work only for the opportunity thus obtained of recording my high satisfaction in finding the views of so mighty a thinker as Mr. John Stuart Mill at one with mine in his recently published Examination of the Hamiltonian Philosophy. *My* philosophy, I need not remind you, Sir, has been "attacked" in your pages; but neither by the writer of the "attack," nor by any one else, has the attempt ever been made to *refute* it.

A little more in allusion to "Whither we are Tending," and I have done. The Rev. J. J. Tayler, speaking at the

late meeting at the Crystal Palace as Principal of Manchester New College, lamented that "some of the young men they sent out into the world, who were more rash than wise, and had more of the impulsive than the reverential spirit in them, said and did things which must be deplored." I required not this confirmation by Mr. Tayler of the conviction that he *intends* neither to originate nor encourage any of these things: but I am not the less convinced that what he laments is one of the natural outflows from the philosophico-religious seminary which his College has become, and one that will spread and grow among our youthful ministers so long as they are instructed on the principles by himself stated to be there adopted. By his office Mr. Tayler is "Professor of the Truths and Evidences of Christianity;" which, in a *Unitarian* College,* supported by *Unitarian* funds, appears to me to mean that he is morally bound to teach, and that definitely and positively, those truths and evidences in a manner consistent with the light in which they are regarded by proper Unitarianism. But Mr. Tayler tells us that Christianity, in his view, is "that religion of faith and love which is taught in the New Testament," and at the same time maintains that his description of it is neither "vague" nor "ambiguous." I ask if anything can be *more* "vague" or "ambiguous," since the New Testament "faith and love" are understood to mean a thousand different things by professed followers of Christ, and we, I repeat, as Unitarians, require from our theological tutors some accordance with the Unitarian acceptation of them. Again, Mr. Tayler summarises the objects of his instructions as these, "to cultivate the spirit of devout religion, and encourage the spirit of free, fearless, intellectual inquiry." No small number of the

* The Rev. J. J. Tayler, in a letter to *The Inquirer*, objects to Manchester New College being represented by Dr. Cromwell as a "Unitarian College," alleging that it is, and has always been, a College of "Unsectarian Theology." Theoretically, Mr. Tayler is correct; but it is practically, and has long been, a Unitarian College: its theological teachers were chosen because, in addition to their eminent literary qualifications, they were Unitarians; its theological students are Unitarians, and the denominational almanac for the present year represents it as "the chief seat of learning of the Unitarian body, at which most of the Unitarian ministers are educated." So that, in reality, Dr. Cromwell is perfectly right.—Ed. Ch. Un.

young men so instructed seem to have summarised their lessons a little further, even as though they understood them thus: "Be devout—and think what you please."

One parting word. While our leaders would no longer be called "Unitarian," nor allow the "Unitarian Association" to be called so, they have favoured us with no suggestion of any other designation they would prefer. "Liberal Christian" is said to be likely to find favour with them; but then, "Liberal Christian," or indeed simple "Christian," is essentially as doctrinal a term as "Unitarian," and they would be without *any* doctrinal name. Let me propose, then, that we be in future styled an Association of Transcendental Deists. True, to some extent, even this also must be doctrinal; for, alas! so far as I have read religious history, and can note existing facts, there never was a church, or other religious society, yet, which had not *some* doctrine to be named by and supported for. Mr. Martineau, we know, lately made the assertion, and that in print, that "while the Unitarian is the only church not bound by doctrine, it is the only one known by a doctrinal name." But this, of course, he could only say as a Transcendentalist; Transcendentalism, as every philosopher is aware, taking small account of facts, whether of history or every-day "experience." One writer, I remember, describes Transcendentalism as "subtle, daring, proud;—intolerant of the world of realities lying without, and assuming to weave by its own dialectics all truth from the mind within." I should be the last to apply this description in its entirety to the Transcendentalism either of Mr. Martineau or Mr. Tayler; but, unhappily, I have met with those, proclaiming themselves their disciples, who exemplify it to the letter. Nor can it be denied, I suppose, that Transcendentalism—or that something, whatever it may be, which is said to *transcend* everything so humble as "experience"—is *the* doctrine of our new school, both as to philosophy and religion. To which I presume to add, that there is nothing in its notion of Christ as "a realization of the religious idea of our humanity,"—nothing in its views of the person, the office, the works, or the resurrection of Jesus, or indeed of the New Testament taken at large,—but what is easily reconcilable with a pure and refined

Deism. Yes, Sir, it is *that* we are fast tending to, TRANSCENDENTAL DEISM, and we may as well at once frankly confess it. For myself, when I am so enlightened as to be able to follow in the wake of our distinguished leaders, I shall acknowledge no other "doctrinal" appellation.

T. CROMWELL.

CANTERBURY, *June 5th*, 1866.

THE FIRST MIRACLE.

A SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSON.—No. 5.

THERE are some places in nowise remarkable, save in connexion with the events of history. And this may be said of Cana, a small and very obscure town of Galilee, yet which we must ever regard with interest, because in it Nathaniel, the Israelite without guile, was born; and more than this, on account of its being the place where our Lord wrought his first miracle, that of turning water into wine. Cana was but a few miles from Nazareth, where Jesus spent his early days, and from whence he no doubt frequently went to Cana in his youth. The town was built on a small hill rising out of a pleasant valley. Clear and beautiful water ran from a spring near it. A village yet exists on the spot where ancient Cana stood, and it is remarkable, that very large water-pots, or stone troughs, are still to be found there, these being of great antiquity.

The history of this, the first miracle, as we find it in St. John's Gospel, is exceedingly pleasing, whilst it illustrates some interesting particulars respecting Jewish manners and customs. Thus, we have the marriage feast,—the large company of friends assembled,—the governor of the festival,—and the great vessels filled with water, for the purposes of purification. Each of these subjects requires explanation. Weddings among the Jews were occasions of great solemnity as well as rejoicing. There were the bridegroom, and the friend of the bridegroom,—the bride, with a number of attendant young females,—there were midnight processions by torchlight,—and there was the cry, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him." All within was

light with every token of gladness; all without was darkness after "the door was shut." Many persons, friends of the families, were invited to be present, and each of these was expected to bring a gift to the newly-married pair. The wine made by our Lord may well be imagined to have been the present given by him for himself and his disciples. It is very likely that the bride and bridegroom were his personal and intimate friends, long known to, and highly esteemed by him. What honour thus to be known, thus to be noticed! The governor of the feast was a person chosen, on account of his years and respectability, to preside over the guests—to see that the wants of each were supplied—to take care that temperance, with the strictest moderation, at table, was observed, and that the mirth should always be innocent. Lastly, the Jews required much water for purification, especially for the hands, as well as for the continual washing of the cups, basins, and other utensils commonly used. Of this we have a striking account in the seventh chapter of Mark. So we see why the six water-pots of stone were there, and these of large size, "containing two or three firkins a-piece."

And now our Saviour began to manifest forth his glory. The wine was expended, and perhaps there were no human means of procuring more. When the mother of Jesus hints the matter to him, "They have no wine," we must not suppose there was anything disrespectful in his reply, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come." For, you may recollect, he used the same term to her whilst he was hanging in agony on the cross—"Woman, behold thy son," meaning by her son, then, the Apostle John. And we are told that the word "woman" was in common use at that time, even when addressing ladies of the highest rank. But our Lord plainly intimated now, that not even his mother must direct him in the work he had undertaken; to God, and to him alone, he owed obedience in the great business of our salvation.

We see, from our Saviour's conduct here, the cheerful and benevolent character of his religion. Well has good Dr. Watts taught us to sing, that "Religion never was designed, to make our pleasures less." At the very outset

of his work, the work especially given him to do—that of reforming men—making them wiser, better, holier, more like God, more fit for heaven, Jesus is found with his disciples at a festival, sanctioning it by his presence and his participation. As a matter of course all was innocent mirth; there was no excess either in eating or drinking; there was pleasantry, but no mocking levity—nothing offensive to morality, to decency, to good manners; at the same time there was gladness of countenance, the heart was light, the enjoyment was great and it was unsullied. We cannot, it is true, be always in scenes of festivity, nor always recreating ourselves. Life is a serious thing, and its great business should be seriously pursued. But God sends to us now and then a cheerful hour, and we are gratefully to take it, for here, "to enjoy is to obey." Thus we have seasons of relaxation afforded to us—these let us be thankful for—thus using the world, but not abusing it.

What great power was given to the Lord Jesus! The elements, the winds and the sea, obeyed his voice, and became still. He who calmed the storm with a word, had but to will it, and the water instantly becomes wine, better than the first wine, and in quantity far more than sufficient for the present use. In this he shewed himself to be a great prophet, the beloved of the Father; and yet with the utmost humility he ever ascribes all his wonderful gifts to God who sent him—who filled him with the Spirit above measure. The only conclusion to which we can reasonably come is, that Jesus is the Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. He not only spake as never man spake, but he worked as never man worked. God gave him testimony from on high. God gave him power to save to the uttermost all who should come to him. May we be of the blessed number, that as such we may be owned at the great day. See also our Lord's benevolence of disposition, and how conspicuously he here displayed it. The miracle was not one of cheerful condescension to the guests alone, but it marked great kindness and consideration towards the bridegroom and bride. They were young housekeepers, and had, we may properly imagine, gone to some expense in their preparations for the entertainment. It may have been beyond

their means for the time, and such as might have caused some difficulty afterwards. Jesus, in the most delicate manner, remunerates them, and in a way the most unexpected. He had neither silver nor gold, but the wine would be a valuable present, and much more than repay the outlay incurred. Thus we see the Lord's thankfulness, even in the matter, and at the time of enjoyment, teaching us to be considerate for others, for their circumstances and their feelings, to do everything kindly, tenderly, as brethren, all children of one family, whose father is God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

B.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTER OF THE REV. S. BACHE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

My Dear Sir,—Accept my cordial thanks for your clear, consistent, rational, and eminently Christian "Review of Recent Proceedings in the British and Foreign Unitarian Association," in this month's number of your valuable periodical. I take this opportunity of offering them to you, to enter my distinct and earnest protest against an increasing tendency in our denomination, the universal prevalence of which would be destruction of all religious principle and conviction, and plunge mankind again into that low and narrow secularism from which it has been the very object of Divine Revelation to raise us.

The tendency to which I refer is that of eliminating intellect from religion. Many writers of our denomination imply, or allege, that our immediate predecessors in the Christian ministry laid too great stress on the mere intellectual apprehension, and too little on the practical and benevolent applications, of their Christian faith. Such implications and allegations I declare, from my own personal knowledge, to be *utterly false*, and I wish to record, in your pages, my distinct and unqualified and most earnest protest against them. It was my privilege and happiness to enjoy the most intimate personal acquaintance with many of my beloved and venerated predecessors in the Christian ministry, and I can confidently affirm that no men ever have surpassed, or ever can surpass, them in practical Christian benevolence. They did not, indeed, *parade* their benevolent exertions, as it is the fashion with so many men at the present day to do. They reverenced the divine authority of their Teacher and Lord—that authority which so many now renounce—and therefore endeavoured to conduct themselves in conformity with his sacred precept—"When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee as the hypo-

crites do, that they may have glory of men: but when thou doest thine alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret, and thy Father, who seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly."—(Matt. vi. 2, 3.)

I deny, unequivocally, that any of our Christian ministers of the present age surpass these, our predecessors, in practical Christian energy and benevolence. But in indissoluble union with this practical Christian energy and benevolence, these our predecessors habitually cherished and exercised a discriminating and reverential intelligence in the investigation and avowal of the truth of that Christian Revelation to which they felt themselves primarily indebted for their purest principles and highest and noblest aspirations. They would have been shocked, as I am, at the ignorant presumption which confounds the direct and special revelation of God's truth and will with the ordinary manifestations of them, and they would have earnestly protested, as I do, against it. I desire to record this protest also in your pages, because I read in the *Christian Freeman* of the present month (July, p. 154), as one of the anticipated results of the London Unitarian Lay Preachers' Union, that "not a few of the disputes and questions about words now agitating many among us, will be hushed to perpetual silence in view of the realities of Christian labour the Lay Preachers' Union will seek out and supply for us all to do." This is just the evil which I have apprehended for a considerable time past, and which I feel it my duty to resist. It is *not* a dispute about *words* which is agitating us, but about *the sacred realities* which those words have been universally appropriated to designate. There are men who cannot accept these *realities*, yet claim the words as expressive of their opinions; and when you ask them to define their meaning, in order that you may know whether you can conscientiously unite with them or not in doctrinal association and profession, they charge you with bigotry and intolerance, and refuse to answer you. I affirm, without fear of rational contradiction, that such vagueness is never permitted in the use of language in connexion with important secular interests; much less, therefore, ought it to be permitted in connexion with the infinitely more important interests of religious truth. No doubt, distinctness and definiteness in this connexion will clearly bring to light many wide diversities of individual opinion, and these diversities will very often necessarily require separation in the maintenance and avowal of such opinion. Such separation, however, is so far from being injurious, that it is the very agency which God has ordained for the clear elucidation and advancement of intellectual truth and the culture and exercise of personal conscientious integrity. Doctrinal separation is so far from necessarily involving any alienation of spirit and affection, that its just and legitimate tendency is the very opposite. Every man who has intelligently and seriously gone through the process of rational enquiry and investigation, understands, by his own experience, the doubts and difficulties which he has to encounter, and therefore understands fully how other equally intelligent and careful enquirers may arrive at different or even opposite conclusions. Does he demand that they should merge those conclusions, and the distinctive practical appli-

cations of them, into his own? Quite the contrary. He necessarily separates from them in his own individual applications, else he would be practically renouncing his own intelligent convictions. Does he thereby manifest any spirit of dislike or hostility towards those from whom he differs? Quite the contrary. By consistently avowing and maintaining his own convictions, he gives his highest testimony to the obligation of other men to do the same with theirs, and manifests most clearly his unity of spirit with all who do so.

Hence I am, as I have often publicly avowed, in entire sympathy with my orthodox friends on this point. They conscientiously believe that certain doctrinal views of Christianity are essential to salvation, and they therefore honestly avow and maintain those views and with this practical reference. I differ from them entirely in this matter of belief, and therefore cannot unite with them in the avowal and maintenance of these views or of this principle. But do I denounce them, on that account, as narrow, bigoted, or intolerant? Not in the least. I earnestly reverence their conscientious consistency, and the more cordially unite with them in labours of usefulness and benevolence in which they and I can efficiently co-operate without involving any compromise of individual conviction on the part of any of us. How can freedom and liberality be greater than this? I affirm that it is, in the nature of things, impossible. And as a consequence, the treatment which I have always received from my orthodox brethren, even when standing in direct controversial opposition to them, has been just, and liberal, and eminently Christian, exhibiting a marked contrast with that which I have received, and am still receiving, from many of the boastful advocates of a liberty which, being only "the utmost liberty of private haziness" (as it is justly described by an able writer in the *Fortnightly Review*), involves, in all formal and responsible associations, a practical tyranny to which I will not consent to be subjected.

If life and health be prolonged, I hope to avail myself of your "*Christian Unitarian*" for recording and promulgating my views of the real nature of Freedom and Revelation, in order that, if I be in error, I may place myself thereby in a position to have my error pointed out and corrected; or, if I be right, that others may have the benefit of my principles and views in connexion with these practically *most* important topics.—Believe me, my dear Sir, very truly yours,

SAMUEL BACHE,

Church of the Messiah, Birmingham.

July 10, 1866.

THE LONDON UNITARIAN LAY PREACHERS' UNION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—It may be interesting to our friends in the country as well as in London to know something of the aims of this new society. It has been long felt, by all of us, that the few churches we have in London are not adequate to the need of our cause

among three millions of people, scattered over 110 square miles,—the present extent of London; while we have at present many Unitarian families in London a great distance from any of our churches, so far that they feel it impossible to get their children and aged members to join in the worship of Almighty God and properly instructed in the truths of our pure and simple religion. Again, we have constantly coming to London from our churches in the country those who seek in vain a place where Unitarians join for worship, so widely separate are our chapels. There is one other reason not less weighty at the present time,—we believe there are tens of thousands of persons who feel themselves alienated from Christian worship from the simple fact that again and again their reason, common sense, and affection have been outraged, shocked, and wounded by the general teaching of the pulpit. Here, then, is a duty at our door, that the aged and the young of our own household of faith, and those who are panting for religious fellowship consistent with the exercise of a free, faithful, and loving heart, may be met and supplied. Now the object of the London Unitarian Lay Preachers' Union, is to open halls and rooms in many places for Sunday religious worship and week-day doctrinal and other lectures. Our ministers in London are sufficiently engaged with their various pastorates; therefore a few of our laymen are willing to do a part of this needful work of diffusing Christian truth, and of helping to form new centres or churches from which works of Christian usefulness may emanate. God has blessed the most of our people with a fair share of useful knowledge, and of Christian character and sympathy, who are now beginning to feel that they are called upon by Divine Providence and the age we live in, not to eat their morsel of good alone, but to go out and make known the truths which have enriched their minds and made happy their lives. Some will be able to preach discourses of their own preparation; others will be able to read a sermon or parts of good sermons and books to the edification of those who gather together at the different stations. There are others who will join in these humble places of worship, aid in the singing, &c., and thus encourage the formation of a society or Christian church. Others will be able to subscribe liberally to the expenses of these buildings and the purchase of books and tracts for these newly formed societies. All kinds of aid will be accepted. Visitors will be appointed to each district. The one special aim always kept in view will be the diffusion of Christian truth and the promotion of virtue among the people. The Committee has already secured a few places for worship, and arranged for a series of meetings as well, among the members of this Union, for mutual conversation and improvement in theological and religious questions. It is clear to us that this movement will have not a few difficulties to cope with, but it is hoped that the generous and unanimous support it will receive among the members of our churches, will tide it over all its trials. We dare not doubt but, under the blessing of God, this Union will be fruitful of much Christian usefulness. Those who take part in these services will be made to feel, while they minister to others, the duties they engage in are proving an instrument of higher life to themselves. The formation of new societies

will quicken the zeal and energy of all our older churches. Among our families a larger number of young men will be called upon to take part in the public offices of religion, and the talent and power now buried for want of a field of labour will be developed, and the most fit and worthy for the Christian ministry will be encouraged to a course of education and life suitable for future public service in the Christian church. The poor in many localities, and the earnest seekers for Christian truth, will find in these small churches a religious home. And, finally, not a few of the disputes and questions about words now agitating many among us will be hushed to perpetual silence in view of these realities of Christian labour the Lay Preachers' Union will seek out and supply for us all to do.* The members of this Union consist of ladies and gentlemen who are willing to preach, lecture, help in the singing, distribute tracts, and visit the families of the people in the neighbourhood of the stations.—Yours most truly,

ROBERT SPEARS.

27, Grosvenor Park, London, S.

JESUS OUR BROTHER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—A phrase is gaining currency amongst us, on which I am desirous of saying a few words—"Jesus our brother." I have seen it in print, and, as I understand, it finds utterance from the pulpit. To me it savours of affectation or of undue familiarity. Take it either way, its use is highly objectionable, offensive alike to the judgment and the taste, whilst it tends also to diminish that sense of reverential gratitude with which the name of Jesus, so sacred and so dear, has hitherto been associated in our minds. Surely we cannot improve on apostolic precedent and practice; yet we find Paul, James, Peter, John, Jude, continually speaking and writing of their glorified Master in language expressive of the utmost reverence as well as love. Let one example out of many suffice for the purpose; it is as good as ten thousand, and is quite decisive. "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours: grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." Mark the import of the words, the contrast between the persons named. Jesus Christ *is the Lord of Paul—of the Corinthians—of believers*

* We perceive that the Rev. S. Bache, in a letter published in our present number, objects to this passage; and, we must admit with good reason, if by "disputes and questions about words," Mr. Spears refers to the important questions which have for some time agitated the liberal Christian churches in England. The reality of Christ's resurrection, of the direct mission of the Saviour from God, and of the divine authority of revelation, are not "questions of words," but grave and momentous truths, which lie at the very foundation of our religion.—ED. CH. UN.

everywhere. Sosthenes, the companion of Paul, the meek and humble servant of Jesus, is *the brother*. We are brethren one of another, but Paul calls Jesus Lord. I dare not give him a lower appellation.

We are well aware that in the days of his earthly humiliation our Lord was despised and rejected of men, and that he bore emphatically the designation of the "man of sorrows"; that he was, then, truly a man like ourselves, clad as we yet are in the garments of mortality. But we are not to know Christ after the flesh now,—we must look to him rather in the state of exaltation to which, for his obedience unto death, God hath raised him,—we must regard him as the mediatorial king, far above angels, and principalities, and powers—who must reign till all enemies are put under his feet—till the heathen be his inheritance, and till error and sin be for ever annihilated. Such is the Lord Jesus, and as such must we devoutly regard him. With such sentiments, common, as I gladly believe, to the very great majority of my Unitarian friends, I must be permitted to record my protest against a form of words uncalled-for in itself, hitherto unknown to us, and which is not more repulsive to the feelings, than opposed to the dictates of the sound understanding. It is not after this manner that I have learned Christ.—Yours faithfully,

BETA.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY OF LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE.

THE anniversary of the Provincial Assembly of Presbyterian and Unitarian Congregations of Lancashire and Cheshire was held at Liverpool on June 21st. The service was held in Hope Street Church,—the Rev. L. Taplin leading the introductory devotions, and the Rev. B. Herford preaching, from 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8, on "the call of the time to the ministry of the Free Churches." The business meeting was held in the school-room, the Rev. W. Gaskell in the chair. Mr. H. A. Bright read the "report of the Missionary Branch of the Assembly," and Mr. Shipman the report of the "Committee on Ministers' Salaries." Both reports led to some discussion. At five o'clock, about 250 ladies and gentlemen dined in the Royal Assembly Room, Great George's Street,—Swinton Boult, Esq., presiding. The Rev. J. Wright spoke to the sentiment of "The Provincial Assembly," and the Rev. C. Beard to that of "Manchester New College." "Civil and Religious Liberty" was responded to by R. Heywood, Esq.; "Our Missionary Institutions," by the Rev. S. A. Steinthal; and "Our Denominational Literature," by Rev. B. Herford. On the Friday evening, a soiree in connexion with the Provincial Assembly was held in Hope Street School-room—the Rev. C. Wicksteed presiding, who, in his introductory address, gave an interesting sketch of the history of the Assembly. Mr. H. Bright spoke on "The Church," and addresses were also delivered by the Rev. F. Bishop on "The Home," and the Rev. J. Worthington on "The School."

NORTH MIDLAND PRESBYTERIAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this Association was held in Nottingham on July 3rd. The devotional service was conducted by the Rev. J. L. Short, and the Rev. T. Hincks preached from 2 Cor. v. 14. About sixty-five persons afterwards attended the collation, and the business meeting followed, at which the Rev. P. W. Clayden presided. He dwelt on the two-fold object of the Association—to form a means of intercommunion amongst brethren of the same household of faith, and to carry out a missionary work. The Secretary, Rev. A. W. Worthington, read the report of the Committee, which was adopted. Thanks were voted to the preacher, and a cordial welcome was given to D. Martineau, Esq., who attended as a deputation from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Various resolutions were moved and seconded by the Revs. F. Bishop, A. Macdonald, W. Oates, and C. C. Coe, and Messrs. Heymann, Beckett, and Richards. The visiters were afterwards entertained at tea by the congregation.

KENT AND ESSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

The fifty-fourth anniversary of this Association was held in the Old Presbyterian Chapel, Maidstone, on July 11th. The Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, minister of the place, conducted the devotional service, and the Rev. W. James, of Bristol, preached from Acts xv. 6. The preacher referred particularly to the present position of the Unitarian Church. He argued for the rational and Scriptural character of the Unitarian faith, and contended that no advantage could arise to the cause of truth and righteousness from the abandonment of the Unitarian *name*. After the service, nearly fifty ladies and gentlemen dined together, the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan presiding. Various denominational and philanthropic sentiments were spoken to by the Revds. W. James, E. Talbot, T. B. W. Briggs, T. Rix; and by Messrs. C. Ellis, Jun., T. Wells, G. Ruck, and Askew.

NEW SWINDON.

We are requested to state that an arrangement has been entered into, by which the liberal cause of the Free Christian Church, New Swindon, will be extended and strengthened. Through the kindness of a friend at a distance, who is very much interested in the welfare of the Rev. F. R. Young's church and congregation, he has been enabled to offer the post of Assistant Minister to the Rev. J. A. Brinkworth, of Trowbridge, who has accepted that offer, and will enter upon his duties on or before Michaelmas next. Mr. Brinkworth was formerly connected with the Primitive Methodist Body as a Revival preacher, and has travelled in England and through portions of America, holding Revival services. Some years ago, chiefly through the instrumentality of our beloved and venerated friend, the Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge, Mr.

Brinkworth was induced to embrace Unitarian views of Christianity, since which time he has supplied the pulpits of Bradford-on-Avon, Shepton-Mallet, and Warminster, besides giving occasional help, in the form of pulpit services, to Mr. Martin. Mr. Young desires to express his thankfulness to God for the liberality of the Christian friend who has thus enabled him to obtain the help he has so long needed, while he confidently expects that this arrangement will result in good to his Church and the neighbourhood generally.

STANHOPE STREET NATIONAL SCHOOLS, BELFAST.

The annual examination of the children of these schools, which are under the patronage of Miss Whitla, Ben-Eaden, took place in three divisions, on Thursday, July 5, at the school-house. The Rev. J. Scott Porter, the Rev. T. Bowring, R. Nesbitt, Esq., District Inspector, with Miss Whitla and Mrs. Smith, and several other ladies, were present. The boys, the girls, and the infants, were separately examined, and in each case great satisfaction was expressed. Several of the boys exhibited drawings, after models, which were considered very correct, whilst the girls displayed creditable progress in needlework, plain and ornamental. The singing, also, in each school, was of a most pleasing kind, with an entire absence of display. The exercises in arithmetic, geography, and history, shewed that great pains had been taken by the well-qualified teachers in imparting instruction on these important subjects to the minds of the scholars. It must not be omitted to mention, that the answers given in the Infant School were very satisfactory, and, in two or three instances, quite surprising from children so young. A number of premiums, to the more deserving of the scholars, and especially as rewards for regularity and punctuality of attendance, were distributed, with words of kindly greeting, by Mr. Porter and Mr. Bowring; and, after singing *God save the Queen* and *Rule Britannia* in full and hearty chorus, the "young people" separated for three weeks' holiday. The very clean and neat appearance of the scholars, with their extremely orderly conduct, drew forth the most marked approbation from all present.

OBITUARY.

Died, on July 9, at Great George's Street, Belfast, James Chester, eldest son of the late Rev. James Malcolm, of Chester, aged 14 years.

Died, on July 11, at the Milltown, Ballyclare, Stephen Archer, Esq., aged 48 years.

Died, on July 9, of paralysis, Eliza, only surviving daughter of the late Mr. John Dundee, Bruslee, Ballyclare.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] SEPTEMBER, 1866. [No. 8.

THE NEW CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.

WE have had occasion more than once to refer, in the pages of *The Christian Unitarian*, to a movement among certain English brethren which aims at discarding the Unitarian name, and establishing what they are pleased to characterise as a Catholic or Universal Church, within whose ample courts Christians of the most diverse and conflicting opinions in theology, and men who accept and men who reject a Divine Revelation may find relief from the din of sects, and may worship together in the unity of the spirit. The movement is an attractive one, and, being promoted by some of the ablest men in the denomination, it has won considerable support. It has been advocated in leading articles in the denominational newspapers, in sermons, speeches, and letters, and we may fairly presume that through such agencies it has gained numerous adherents, and is seriously entertained in many Unitarian congregations. We purpose, therefore, to consider what it involves, and how far it is deserving of the support which it has already received. We frankly confess that, to our mind, it is a Utopian scheme, which, though at the first glance it seems plausible enough, can never succeed in uniting the various sects in Christendom: the only union which it may accomplish is that of Unitarian Christians with unbelievers—a union in which the Christian element would speedily be absorbed, and all that would remain would be simply a church without a Christ.

As we contemplate Christianity in these kingdoms, with its innumerable divisions and sub-divisions, it seems to consist of three great leading denominations, numeri-

cally very unequal, but yet so essentially distinct, that they cannot be grouped together—Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Unitarians. Protestants are in principle so entirely opposed to the authority of the Church of Rome, that we cannot conceive of any plan, however ingeniously recommended, that would lead them to unite, and form one Church. So far, therefore, as the new movement is concerned, we think its most ardent supporters must admit that it can accomplish nothing in this direction. A community of sentiment we believe does exist between members of the Roman Catholic and of the Protestant churches; and in each we gladly acknowledge the influence of a common Christian faith, moving them to deeds of piety and holiness; and if, according to our imperfect knowledge, we were drawing up a list of saints —holy men who had lived Christ, and blessed the world by the piety and holiness of their life—we should probably find the one denomination as rich in such worthies as the other. But, admitting all this, we see no ground for expecting that they will sink their differences, and form themselves into one Church.

Now, Protestants differ widely from each other in doctrine, in church government, and in other matters; but there is among them, generally, so much similarity of opinion, that on many occasions we find them joining in worship, and co-operating to promote those Christian principles which they hold in common. In illustration of this fact, we might refer to various associations supported by those who are commonly, but most incorrectly, designated the Evangelical sects. But that class of Protestants who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, and, worshipping God in One Person—the Father—are known as Unitarians, are not recognised or received into communion by their fellow-Protestants of the Trinitarian churches. These regard the Trinity and its concomitant doctrines as an essential part of the Christian religion, and indeed many of them, as being essential to salvation; and no matter how unreasonable to us such opinions may appear, we yet know that our fellow-Protestants hold them strongly; and, while they do, it is worse than folly to expect that they will unite in a common church organization with their Unitarian neighbours. But to

such a union there is, in our mind, another insuperable objection. Those who are, from deep conviction, Unitarian Christians, will not, cannot conscientiously, join in the worship of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. With their simple and common-sense interpretation of the Master's words, they feel that they would not worship truly if they worshipped any other being but the Father. We know that some who, from accident, have been connected with a Unitarian Church, and others who have no serious thought on the matter, see no difficulty in a Trinitarian service; and a few, by some ingenuity of reasoning too complicated for our comprehension, seem to justify a Trinitarian worship, if it be that of the State Church, although they are satisfied that reason and Scripture alike condemn it. But we repeat that earnest and conscientious Unitarians cannot join their fellow-Christians in worshipping a Trinity. That this is no mere sentimentalism—no strange eccentricity possessing a few inferior minds—let the history of Unitarianism in its struggles and its sacrifices testify: let the many great and good men who, in obedience to conscience and in fidelity to what they regarded as a precious truth of Revelation, abandoned rank and emolument, subjected themselves to odium and calumny, struggled in penury, or meekly endured imprisonment, bear witness; and, in our own time, when some, through a strange and delusive dream of Catholicity, are recommending the abandonment of the Unitarian name, let those, too, bear witness, who are willing to forego worldly gain, and to encounter the sneer of the fashionable, the anathemas of the Church, and the condemnation of the multitude, rather than compromise their Christian convictions and do violence to their conscience. To expect that through any new organization, such as has been recommended by the Nottingham Committee, and urged by some able but speculative divines, there shall be an amalgamation of Trinitarians and Unitarians, is, in our mind, the highest folly. We have no doubt that in this opinion the majority of both denominations would agree with us; but we are glad to be able to strengthen our own view of the matter by the following extract from a leading article in one of those weekly papers which have advocated

"the New Catholic Movement." The *Unitarian Herald* has the following sensible remark:—

"The Orthodox societies will not admit a Unitarian fellow-labourer, and Orthodox Christians will not work in Unitarian societies. In this they are consistent. Our views and theirs as to the essence of religion, the test of truth, the terms of acceptance with God, are so fundamentally different, that to profess that both classes of believers are working together in the same Sunday School, or Mission, is only a mockery, unless one or other of them is untrue to their convictions. Whatever be the theories or our desires, the Unitarians of England must join together to do their work, or must remain disunited and isolated." *

The opinions expressed in this extract are such, we think, as all candid observers will admit to be correct; and as no organization, with or without a name, which we can conceive, could bring into one church for Christian worship and Christian work, those who are in theology Trinitarian and those who are Unitarian, it follows of necessity that if "The New Catholic Movement" accomplish anything towards uniting those who hitherto have been separated, it must be in the direction of unbelief. And in this direction we believe it has accomplished something, and is likely to accomplish more. Let us drop the name of Unitarian, associated as it is in the minds of many with the distinctly Christian principles of such men as Priestly, Belsham, and Channing; let us abandon an historical Christianity; let us admit that Revelation may mean nothing more than "discoveries" which the human mind has made; let us admit that the essential element of Christianity is love to our neighbour; and we have thus a broader platform on which Christian and Deist may stand, and worship, and work as brethren. This is the most that can be looked for by this new movement; and, with this in view, we can well understand the hearty and earnest efforts which are made by certain parties to carry it on. But are the Unitarians who believe in the mission of Christ from God, and in the divine authority with which he spoke, satisfied to join in any church organization which sinks those principles for sake of union with their sceptical neighbours? We hope not. By such a union they would gain nothing, and they would suffer much. Those Christian truths

* *Unitarian Herald*, July 20, p. 243, column 2.

which they prize as their light, their strength, and their consolation, would gradually be crushed out, and they or their children would find themselves, by and bye, members of a church which, with perhaps the name of Christian, would be purely and entirely Deistical, resting on a human philosophy which might degenerate into anything or nothing. Some of the English Unitarian Churches use a liturgical service in their public worship. That service is, in most cases, perhaps in all, thoroughly Christian, acknowledging the divine mission of the Saviour, his resurrection from the dead, and the authority of Revelation. But such a service seems to be very much of the nature of a creed; and being so, it will need some kind of expurgatorial process to fit it for the new Catholic Church. We have seen certain hymns so altered as to meet the conscientious feelings of the unbeliever—all distinctly Christian principle having been discharged from them, and little left but the metre, and a general acknowledgment of God's goodness. And, in a similar way, we may expect to see the various Forms of Prayer revised and amended, so as to accord with the sentiments and respect the scruples of all who may attach themselves to this new Catholic Church.

In connexion with this subject much has been written against the name "*Unitarian*." It is a doctrinal name, and we are told that "scarcely one of the orthodox churches is founded upon a doctrinal name." True; but are those churches therefore indifferent about doctrine, and ready to change it from time to time? Quite the contrary. Although their name may not present any doctrinal view, their creeds do definitely and minutely; and those creeds, rather than the name which may have been accidentally adopted, is the foundation on which they rest. Again, it is objected that the term "Unitarian" does not really convey a correct impression of the doctrines of our Church. We are told that it merely denotes an abstract principle which we hold respecting the oneness of the Godhead. That is indeed what etymologically it signifies, and an important principle it is, which we deeply regret to find some, who would be our teachers in theology, representing as of little value. But Unitarianism in connexion with Christianity implies

much more than an abstract principle. What denominational term, we ask, in the Christian Churches, means only what its etymology denotes? When we say that such a man is a Protestant, do we mean merely to convey the idea that he is one who approves of the Protest which the friends of the Reformation made against a certain decree in 1529? Surely not; the word, in the mind of all of us, expresses much more than that. When a neighbour informs us that he is a Baptist, do we understand simply that he contends for the rite of immersion? If that were all, he might be a Baptist and not a Christian; but the term, whether applied to the General or Particular Baptist, is universally understood to express also distinct Christian principles. There is a numerous and important sect in the United States of America known as Universalists; but to regard them as holding simply the doctrine of universal salvation, would be greatly to misapprehend the Christian views which they are known to entertain. And so with the term "Unitarian," as the distinguishing name of a Christian denomination. It expresses, in its etymology, a principle which Unitarians hold respecting the nature of the Deity, and in which they differ from the great body of their fellow-Christians; but it is well known to express much more. In proof of this we might refer to many statements of Unitarian belief which have been published, and widely circulated in these countries. Enough that we should specify the eloquent and faithful exposition of Unitarian Christianity presented by the late Dr. Channing, in his discourse at the ordination of Jared Sparks, in Philadelphia. It is impossible to have a name which will express every opinion entertained by a denomination of Christians; and, as the name "Unitarian" has been held so long, and has been maintained at much sacrifice, and against much opposition,—as it is a name which is interwoven with so much that is interesting and noble in the history of Dissent in these kingdoms,—and, still more, as it is a name which conveys a standing protest against what we deem a great error respecting the God whom we worship, and embodies a clear enunciation of his absolute and undivided Unity, we trust there are many in our denomination who will hold by it, despite of

the plausible arguments that are adduced and the persistent efforts that are made against it, and will still rejoice to acknowledge themselves *Christian Unitarians*.

Some, in considering this "New Catholic Movement," have been strangely led astray by the history of old Presbyterian Chapels and Trust Deeds in England. Their forefathers in possession of these Chapels and Trusts were Trinitarians, perhaps Calvinists; in the course of time their descendants changed their views, and became Unitarians; they have therefore no right, it is alleged, to bind Unitarianism on their descendants, as the Trinitarianism of their predecessors was not bound on them. That is perfectly true: but they have, on the other hand, no right to stifle their convictions, or undervalue them; whatever truth God gave them, it is surely their duty to hold and profess, not in bigotry or intolerance, but yet firmly and consistently. Let us be faithful to our own convictions, and leave posterity to deal with theirs. We wonder what kind of a service could be inaugurated under this new *regime*, in one of the old chapels, so that it would be adapted to the present worshippers, and also to those that would come after them for all time! The idea of those who come after us being fettered by what we do, or what we call ourselves, is utter absurdity. The freedom which we enjoy and exercise, we may be sure that those who succeed us will as jealously guard, and we trust they will as faithfully use.

It is wonderful to what absurd extremes this idea of a Universal Church leads its advocates. They object to creeds and sects: so do we, in the legitimate meaning of those terms. But they go farther; they will have no doctrine as a part of their faith; and they tell us that Christ inculcated no dogma! They object to human leaders, as Calvin, Luther, Channing: so do we. But they go farther; they seem to reject even the leadership of Christ. He to whom so many of them look up as a kind of patron saint, once wrote of Christ, "He that was greater than the temple, whose soul burst out its walls, is also greater than the Testament, *but yet no master over you or me*, however humble men." And the following passage, from a late article in *The London Inquirer*, seems to point in the same direction, and apparently

seeks to claim for such views the sanction of apostolic authority:—

"The sect in the early Church which set up CHRIST as their leader, turning that holy name into the mere symbol of a party, fell under precisely the same apostolical condemnation as those who set up PAUL and APOLLOS.*

To make the name of Christ the mere symbol of a party, would, of course, be wrong; but to accept him as our "sole leader" is not only right, but is our positive duty; and to condemn the adoption of his name, as we would condemn that of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, exhibits a misapprehension of the relation of the Christian to Christ, and shows too plainly the drift of this "New Catholic Movement." "One is your Master, even Christ," said our Lord himself. And one of his apostles, protesting against the adoption of human leaders, writes, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Nowhere throughout the New Testament is Christ put forward more distinctly as our Master and Lord than in the Epistles to the Church at Corinth; and we are amazed that any one, still retaining a profession of Christianity, should object to Christ being set up as our "sole leader."

What success the advocates of this movement, numerous, able, and zealous as they are, may have, we cannot predict; but if they can organize an association such as they contemplate, without form, without doctrine, and ultimately, we fear, though many of them may not think so, without Christ, they may draw off from the Unitarian denomination those who attach more value to freedom and Catholicity than to Christian doctrine; but we trust that a goodly band may still remain, zealous to maintain not merely the unity of the Deity, but the truth of revealed religion in its doctrines, its duties, and its blessed hopes.

* *Inquirer* of July 28, p. 467, column 2.

THE ACCEPTABLE SACRIFICE.

Nay, not a worthless gift
To Heaven's high altar bring;
O ask thyself thus would'st thou do
To earthly king?

Bring not thy blind and maimed,
Useless for thine employ;
But thy most pure and spotless gift
Offer with joy.

What hath thy God withheld
From thee, O thankless one?
No good or perfect gift—not e'en
His well-loved Son.

Then give him all thou hast—
Thy talents every one—
Thy hands to work, thy heart to love,
Thy feet his paths to run.

Wait not till life and strength
In pleasure are all past;
Give thy whole life, from earliest years,
Unto the last,

Humbly and cheerfully,
A living sacrifice,
And his great love will recompense
All He denies.

REMARKS ON THE CHARACTERISTIC STYLE OF THE APOSTLE JOHN.

In this paper I wish to point out, as briefly as possible, some peculiarities of the Apostle John, which, so far as I am aware, have hitherto been but slightly noticed, or altogether unnoticed by critics and commentators, though they seem not without their importance in the exposition

of the Evangelist's writings. Such of them as are new are submitted, with deference, to the judgment of those who are competent to form an opinion of their correctness. Of course I believe them to be correct, but I am ready to be taught better if I have gone astray.

I. The first characteristic which I notice in the writings of St. John is a tendency to repetition. He frequently recurs to the same word. He often reiterates the same proposition or sentiment. In some cases he repeats longer passages, in different words but to the same effect. Of all these points I shall produce examples, selected from his Gospel and Epistles.

1. Of the reduplication of the same word we have a familiar example in the phrase "*Verily, verily,*" prefixed to so many of our Saviour's sayings. None of the other evangelists employs this formula. "*Verily* I say unto you" (or "unto thee"), is found, if I rightly calculate, twenty-nine times in Matthew, thirteen times in Mark, and seven times in Luke; but in the Gospel of John we have "*Verily, verily,* I say unto you" (or "unto thee"), twenty-three times, and the single "*verily*" never. This has been pointed out before, and it is the most striking example of word-reiteration: others could be mentioned, but some of them would require reference to the original Greek, which would here be out of place.

2. St. John not unfrequently repeats the same sentiment, not of course in the very same words, but to the same effect in different words. Of this kind of repetition we have a striking example in the 16th and 17th verses of the 3rd chapter of the Gospel.

"16. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life."

Here we have a sublime truth beautifully and simply stated. But John, "the Son of Thunder," is not satisfied till it reverberates like a peal rolling across the sky. Hence he adds—

"17. *For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.*"

Here the parallelism is too obvious to be overlooked, the second statement being immediately subjoined to the

first without anything interposed. In several cases the Evangelist recurs to the same idea after a short interval. Of this there are many examples in the Evangelist's First Epistle. One very frequent kind of repetition is *first* to state a proposition and *then* to contradict its opposite. So in 1 John iii. 6.

"Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not; *whosoever sinneth hath not seen him nor known him.*"

And the reader will observe that, in the six verses which follow, the same sentiment is reiterated several times, in varying forms of expression, but to the same purport.

3. Of the repetition of larger passages we have several examples in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of the Gospel, to which the references placed in the margin of the English Bible will be a sufficient guide.

II. A striking peculiarity of this Apostle's style is seen in his mode of narrating our Lord's parables.

The other Evangelists sometimes give the simple narrative of the parable—the naked story—without any explanation. Sometimes they give the narrative, prefixing or subjoining a word or two, expressing the object which our Saviour had in view when he delivered it. In a few instances they give the narrative, and afterwards introduce our Lord's explanation of it at full length. It is peculiar to the Apostle John that he gives the explanation in detail, but *never* gives the narrative on which it is founded. Of this we find an example in the *Parable of the Vine and the Branches* (John xv. 1, &c.)

"I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away; and every *branch* that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may produce more fruit. . . . I am the vine, ye are the branches," &c. &c. &c.

But this is so unlike our Saviour's manner of teaching, as unfolded by his biographers, that I cannot help thinking that the Apostle, looking upon the *explanation* of the story as more important than the story itself, (which indeed it is, for the narrative was only the vehicle for the explanation), has given the latter without the former. Had Matthew or Luke recorded this part of our Lord's

teaching, it would probably have been set before us somewhat in the following form :—

"A certain husbandman had a vineyard, and in it he planted a choice vine; and it grew up and spread abroad its branches. And he watched it and tended it that it might be the chief vine of his vineyard. And when the time was come that the fruit should appear, he entered into his vineyard and drew nigh to that choice vine, and considered the branches thereof. And he found thereon certain branches which produced no fruit. And he took his pruning-hook, and stretched forth his hand, and cut them off, and cast them forth, and they withered away. And other branches he found which brought forth fruit. And he beheld, and lo, the shoots of those branches were entwined with one another, and they shut out the air and the light, so that the fruit could not come to perfection. And he cut away the hurtful shoots, and cleansed the branches; and they brought forth fruit, and brought it forth abundantly."

It would not be difficult, from the intimations given in what is called the *Parable of the Sheepfold*, (which, however, is nothing more than an explanation), and that of the *Good Shepherd and the Hireling*, (see John x. 1—19), with a little attention to the Scripture style and manner of relating, to reproduce the main features of the narratives on which these passages are apparently founded; but after the example given this may be left to the reader's sagacity.

III. I would remark, that as a historian his manner is fragmentary; such, indeed, is the case with all the Evangelists; hence their books are more appropriately termed *Memoirs* than histories of Christ: but this is more especially observable in the Gospel of John. There is one circumstance which will show this. He records discourses of our Saviour in which he appeals repeatedly, and with every circumstance of solemnity, to his miracles. He records more assertions of this kind than all the rest of the Evangelists put together. He makes our Lord recur again and again to the topic. But in his Gospel he introduces very few miracles. Those which he mentions are the miracle at Cana; the cure of the nobleman's son; that of the impotent man at Bethesda: the feeding of the five thousand; the walking on the sea; the cure of the man blind from birth; the raising of Lazarus; the healing of the ear of Malchus; and his own resurrection. But it is remarkable that, with the exception of

casting out demons, (this Evangelist appears not to have believed in demoniacal possessions), the foregoing afford one specimen, and only one, of each group or class of our Saviour's wonderful works. Hence there is a probability that his book was intended as a sort of text-book, by the assistance of which the events in the life of Christ might be orally illustrated by the Evangelist himself in the first instance, and by his fellow-labourers and successors afterwards. Each of the incidents above specified would naturally suggest to his mind and theirs a multitude of examples of a similar kind, which they could introduce without having them written down, but which to us are lost beyond recovery, except such as are recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. To this fragmentary character of the book the writer himself bears testimony near the end of the Gospel. "And many other signs did Jesus truly in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John xx. 30, 31.)

A STUDENT.

PRAYER IN THE NAME OF CHRIST.

WHAT are we to understand by praying in the name of Christ?

The Jews did not pray in his name, yet we must believe that many of them prayed with fervency of spirit, and brought down upon their heart and life the blessing of God. Christians, we believe, are not generally more regular in their devotions than were some at least of the children of Abraham before the advent of the Messiah, though we may hope that they are free from much of the superstition that characterized the Israelites. We know that they attached much importance to holy places, and that their devotions at least tended to degenerate into mere formalism and ritualism. They supposed that God was more ready to hear them in the temple or the synagogue, and that there only his especial presence dwelt.

We have much light incidentally thrown on their views respecting worship in the question proposed to our Lord by the Samaritan woman at Sychar. The Jews stood up for the temple on Moriah, the Samaritans for that on Gerizim, and each seemed to think that only in one particular place could the glory and the grace of Jehovah reside. We do not say that Christians are all and entirely free from similar superstitions. Who is there in whose mind superstition has not some place? But of this we may be sure, that where the disciples of Christ attach value to particular spots as consecrated, and lay stress on particular forms and rites, they are acting against the Spirit, if not against the words of their Master. The reply which he made to the Samaritan embodies a great Christian truth, as applicable now and here, as in Palestine so many centuries ago—"God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Still, we must acknowledge that fervent piety animated the breasts of many of the Jews, and, despite of their narrow views of God, we must believe that they prayed not only frequently but fervently; yet they did not pray in the name of Christ.

Neither did the followers of John the Baptist pray in Christ's name. We read that John taught them to pray. What instructions he gave them we cannot ascertain; but judging from his character, and from the practical views he took of human life, we may be sure that he did much to relieve their Jewish minds from superstition, and particularly from the undue importance which they had been accustomed to place on outward and ritual services. But when he whom John expected, and whose way he sought to prepare, appeared in Galilee, yet further light was thrown on the nature and value of worship. As the brightness of the morning star melts into the brighter light of the rising sun, so did John's teachings merge into the fuller and clearer revelations of Christ; and we do not wonder that when the Baptist was imprisoned and then murdered, his followers joined themselves to him of whom John represented himself as only the forerunner, and to whose dignity he bore so high and so emphatic a testimony.

Many expressions used by Jesus indicate the value

which he placed on his doctrine and his work. Such are those declarations which he frequently makes of his authority; and such, too, are the words in which he instructs his disciples respecting prayer—"Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you."

To pray in the name of Christ cannot mean to place that name, holy though it is, and sacred though the associations, memories, and hopes that cluster round it are, in the beginning, the end, or any part of our prayers. Such a requirement would render the efficacy of prayer dependent on an outward and verbal accident, and would be entirely at variance with the spiritual character of the religion of Christ. Besides, we do not trace such a prominent and invariable use of the name of Christ in any prayers which the sacred records of our religion contain. Shortly after the ascension of our Lord, when the momentous events which closed his earthly and introduced his heavenly life must have been fresh and deep in their thoughts, we find the Apostles assembled to choose a successor to Judas Iscariot, and having nominated two eligible persons, they proceeded to elect; but they first offered up a prayer, brief to be sure, but not the less a prayer on that account: the words of it are recorded in the first chapter of the book of Acts, but in no part of it do we meet the phrase—"in the name of Christ"—nor any expression of similar import. And further, the prayer which our Lord dictated, and which has been so generally used by Christians—which indeed by many Christians is always used when they pray—contains no such expression. We are justified, therefore, in inferring that to pray "in the name of Christ" evidently does not mean to use those words in the beginning or end or any part of our prayers.

Farther, when our Lord teaches that we should ask in his name, he cannot mean that we should not come directly to God in prayer. It is one great distinction of his religion that he represents God as the Father of all, good, loving, and merciful, and brings us, as it were, into his immediate and ever-abiding presence. Other religions had taught that God must be approached through some other person, as, for example, the High Priest; and this principle in former systems of religion

has in part been engrafted on Christianity; for many seem to think that there is access to God only through the priest and the church ritual. But our Lord teaches us to come directly to God, and seeks to awaken in our hearts "the spirit of adoption," to put into our lips the language and into our hearts the sentiments of children, and directs us to pray to Him as our Father.

Still less can we suppose that without Christ God would not hear us. To entertain such an idea would be to disbelieve our Lord's plainest words, and unreasonably to restrict the illimitable love of our Heavenly Father. His interest in us does not depend on any interference that may be made in our behalf, nor does it spring from the love that Christ felt, or the pain that he endured for us. That love is the essential nature of God, which no sin on our part can extinguish, and which still less could our weakness and helplessness destroy: and Christ and his work are but the expression or result of his love and mercy. What, then, are we to understand by the phrase—"Praying in the Name of Christ?"

To pray in his name implies to pray by his authority. He professes to know God's mind and will, and, therefore, to be a safe instructor and guide for mankind. He tells us that God will hear those who pray to him. Uninstructed by Christ our doubt would utterly destroy our faith, and lead us to abandon prayer altogether, as something which was either impossible for us or unprofitable. How many nominal Christians, through unbelief in God as the hearer of prayer, have virtually given up prayer! If we rest in the doctrine of Christ respecting the unseen One, and believe, as he has taught us, that He is near to us all, and that He loves us all, then shall our prayer be something more than a form of words; into that form there will enter a quickening spirit; it will become the medium of earnest and holy aspirations which shall ascend to heaven and bring down upon us our Father's blessing.

To pray in his name is to pray as his disciples, and in harmony with his doctrine and spirit. Now, he instructs us to attach no importance to mere times and places, to place no value in the language or the length of prayers, and always to bear in mind that it is the heart and not the tongue which prays—the soul and not the body

which worships. It is worthy of remark that our Lord appoints no particular seasons, and directs no particular places, in which his disciples should pray. We find him praying in various places, as circumstances suggested, or the wants of his soul prompted him. How brief at times his petitions, though conveying so much! A few ejaculatory words were the only utterances that escaped his lips. At other times we read that he continued hours in prayer; but we must understand such a season as one of deep communion with God—meditation and prayer mingled together—his soul dwelling on high and momentous themes, and opening itself to the influences of God's Spirit. So we should pray in spirit. What God seeks is the heart; it is through it only we can love and serve Him, and it is through the heart we should endeavour to rise to Him: so it is the heart which must be influenced in devotion, and, according to Christ's doctrine, it is the heart which prays, not the lips. Words are only devotional so far as they express the thoughts and feelings of devotion. Our Lord employed words at times, not, we presume, uniformly, to embody his petitions; and his disciples are aided in their devotions by expressing their desires in words; but evidently the value or efficacy of the prayer does not depend on the correctness or appropriateness of the language employed. It may be rude, uncouth, offensive to "ears polite," but if only it be the expression of devout thought, it is acceptable to God. But we will not doubt that many an earnest supplication has ascended in the name of Christ to the throne of grace, from human hearts, when no word was uttered, no accent whispered.

> If 'tis o'er denied thee
> In solitude to pray,
> Should holy thoughts come o'er thee
> When friends are round thy way,
> Even then the silent breathing
> Of thy spirit raised above,
> Will reach his throne of glory,
> Who is mercy, truth, and love.

And to pray "in the name of Christ," as his disciples, in accordance with his teaching, is to pray rather for spiritual than for temporal blessings. Evidently out-

ward circumstances are common to good and bad, to the believing and unbelieving. Sickness comes on the faithful disciple as well as on the thoughtless sinner. So do adversity, pain, and bereavement; and we have no reason to believe that prayer will be potent to arrest any of those trials. But very different are the spirit and the temper in which the saint and the sinner receive them, and very different are the sentiments which they awaken in the breast of the Christian and the worldling. Prayer going up in the name of Christ to the throne of God will bring down on the believing soul—and in proportion to its believing—the grace of our Heavenly Father, which ministers patience, trust, submission, hope, according to our need. How little of temporal good Christ teaches us to ask—only needful bread from day to day—but how much of spiritual treasure! Then to pray in his name is to pray for spiritual rather than for worldly gifts.

Many have grown up in the belief that we owe to Christ the right, so to speak, of praying to God, and that God is like some eastern monarch whom none dare approach save through the interposition of some one in his confidence. We owe to Christ the knowledge of God, and of the true nature and efficacy of prayer; and we also owe to him such a knowledge of God as tends to banish all those narrow views, and to lead us into the belief that God is ever near and ever kind, more ready to give than we to ask. And while we are so fully taught by our blessed Lord, and so richly encouraged by his promises, we should come boldly to the throne of grace, banishing from our mind all superstitious feelings, and receiving in faith the revelation which God has given us through his Son. Let our words of prayer be only the natural and earnest utterance of our most earnest and devout feelings; and whether our heart be moved to penitence, be struggling with temptation, be clouded with sorrow, or be filled with apprehension, if we look up to God as our loving Father, and in the name—in the spirit of the Saviour—resting in his gracious promises, pray to Him for pardon, strength, comfort, or hope, we shall not pray in vain, but shall feel the truth of Christ's words—"Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you."

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE.

A Sunday-School Lesson.—No. 6.

The Passover was one of the great national feasts, at which it was incumbent on all the male Jews who could at all undertake the journey to go up to Jerusalem, there to worship and offer sacrifices to the Lord of Hosts; and our Saviour, being born a Jew, and anxious at all times to fulfil the righteousness of the law, went with the great body of his countrymen to keep the festival. Hence we find him in the Temple on this occasion, whilst his presence had, doubtless, been sought for and longed for by numbers of persons, who had been told of his miracles and desired to see and hear him. Jesus goes to the Temple, which we read he calls his "Father's House," and he purifies it from the unhallowed traffic which had long been carried on within its courts. He acts here as the messenger—the Son of God—his word and his deeds are with power, and no man could for the time resist his authority. Zeal for God's honour and his holy place and worship, as it were, consumes him. "Take these things hence;" the divine word is obeyed—the house must not be made a house of merchandize.

In order to understand in what this cleansing of the Temple by our Lord consisted, we must bear in mind that there were many courts connected with the Temple, properly so called. These courts were one within another, and the Temple or building itself nearly in the centre; the outermost court of all, and by far the largest, was called the court of the Gentiles, because it was common to both Jews and Gentiles, and beyond it the Gentiles were not allowed to go. Now, it was in this large, outer court, and not in the Temple itself, that the oxen and sheep and the money-changers were assembled—the animals to be sold for sacrifice—the exchangers to give one kind of money for another. First of the animals. You all know that the Jews were commanded to offer numerous sacrifices, and these sacrifices on the Temple altars. Gentiles might also sacrifice if they pleased, but they were not permitted to take the animals to the altars. The wrong-doing, and that which

Jesus punished, was in bringing all this into the place which had been built for the honour of Jehovah and solemnly dedicated to his service. It was unseemly; it disturbed the devotions of the pious believer, and was most unfit for the occasion—the purposes of prayer and praise. Nothing could have been more distracting to the mind, or more grating to the feelings, than the tumultuous crowd of buyers and sellers—the wranglings that must often have taken place—the ceaseless bellowing of the oxen, the bleating of the sheep, and the plaintive cooing of the doves. It was quite necessary that some place in the city should be set apart for this business, for it was a business of great importance,—but not in the Temple—the courts of the living God—these should have been free from noise and tumult; all should have been hushed and peaceful there, that the heart might hold quiet communion with God, that there He might be worshipped in the beauty of holiness.

So of the money-changers. The only silver coin received into the Temple treasury was the sacred shekel, and this appears to have circulated through Palestine. But foreigners—both Jews and Greeks—continually brought to Jerusalem the coins current in their several countries. These had to be exchanged for the shekel before the offerings were brought to the Temple. Persons made it their business, and we may suppose a profitable one, to change one kind of coin for another, and they sat at tables for this purpose. Again, we say there was nothing wrong in this, had it been done elsewhere. But it was wrong to do it in the Temple, for the same reason that it was wrong to bring the animals there, and so all concerned in these various kinds of merchandize were driven away. Thus was the Temple cleansed, and thus was God's holy worship vindicated by him who glorified his Father's name on earth and finished the work given him to do.

From this portion of our Saviour's history we may learn some most important truths, and

1st. That all who fear God have a lively concern for his honour. The whole conduct of Jesus shows this in the strongest manner. The Temple was a building set apart in the most solemn way to the service of the Lord

Jehovah. It was called by his name; it was the appointed place for the tribes to come and to offer sacrifice; everything belonging to it, the meanest vessel, was accounted holy, whilst holy and reverend was the name of the Lord of Hosts. It was therefore highly offensive to the devout feelings that this consecrated place should be profaned by worldly traffic. The beloved Son of God could not bear to see his Father's house thus turned to common purposes, and therefore with the word of power, with the look and attitude of divine authority, he drives away the noisy intruders. We also should have a love for the house of God, and a desire to keep it free from any pollution. To us the place where God's honour dwells should be sacred. It is the place where the saints assemble for prayer and praise—the house of God and the gate of heaven.

2nd. Our Master here gave the fullest proof of his divine commission. The people had heard of him and his wonderful works. They had now, also, heard him speak, and they wondered at the gracious words proceeding from his mouth; for he spake with authority; he acted with dignity as a messenger from on high; and it was this which gave him the power he now possessed over the multitude, and particularly over the cattle-dealers and the money-changers. They were self-convicted, and they had nothing to say for themselves. There was a consciousness of wrong-doing which made them cowards and filled them with apprehension. People who are caught in ill acts are very seldom brave. Sin deprives them of self-esteem, and losing that, they are powerless. So we may suppose the traffickers sneaked from the Temple which they had profaned; they dared not defend their calling; they were abashed through their misdeeds; they could make neither resistance nor reply. Would we be strong, we must seek strength from the Lord to do his will, and then he will be our tower of defence.

3rd. Jesus calls the Temple his Father's house, and we know that he has bid us pray—"Our Father, who art in heaven;" so that the house of prayer is *our* Father's house, and as such, should be duly honoured. For if God be our Father, we are brethren, and we must

be on a perfect equality in his sight. In this house rich and poor meet together, and should, with one heart and voice, praise the Lord their Maker. We ought to love the holy place, and be glad when they say to us, "Let us go into the house of the Lord." We should sit very quietly there,—no talking, no restlessness, no sleeping. We should join devoutly in the services; we should listen with great reverence to the reading of the Scriptures; we should attend to the instructions and exhortations of the preacher. And it is well to come early—before the service begins. A very good old lady, who was always early at church, gave as a reason, that it was part of her religion not to disturb the religion of others. Thus let it be with you. The Saviour has cleansed the Temple for you. You must keep it pure and hallowed, the tabernacle of God for ever.

A NEW PHASE OF THE COLENSO CASE.

Our readers are familiar with the position which Bishop Colenso has for several years held in relation to the English Church, the odium he has incurred, and the legal persecution he has been subjected to, on account of the freedom with which he criticised certain portions of the Old Testament Scripture. But while, by those both in the Church and out of it, who believe in a *verbal* inspiration of Scripture, his name was cast out as evil, many intelligent Christians regarded with interest and approval his critical examination of the Pentateuch, and some were pleased to find that the result of his investigation was not, in the eye of the law, incompatible with his position as a clergyman of the Established Church. It appears, however, that in the further exercise of free inquiry, Dr. Colenso has arrived at the conclusion that there is no Scriptural or apostolical authority for addressing prayers to Christ; and accordingly, in a new edition of a hymn-book which he lately published, every expression which contained a prayer to Christ has been omitted or altered; and, more extraordinary still, the hymn-book does not contain the name of Jesus, or of Christ, from one end to the other!

We are not surprised that an independent inquirer should, from a careful examination of Scripture, arrive at the conclusion that there is no authority for offering prayers to Christ. Not only does the Saviour himself teach us most distinctly to pray to the Father as the only true God, and supply us with the form in which we should address Him—"When ye pray say, Our Father which art in Heaven"—but he distinctly says, "Ye shall ask me nothing." We have no instance in the apostolic writings of prayer being offered to Christ. The case of the dying Stephen is not in point, for Christ seems to have been visible to him, and he called upon him as his Saviour; nor when the disciples are represented as "calling on the name of the Lord" should they be regarded as praying to Christ, for the expression simply teaches that they appealed to him, or looked to him for help. The distinct teaching of our Lord, and the teaching and practice of his apostles are so clear on this subject, that we are not surprised at Dr. Colenso, when he had broken through the stereotyped form of thought which prevails in the English Church, arriving at the conclusion that we should not pray to Christ; we are only surprised that all who seek to read the Scriptures with unbiassed mind, in order to learn what they teach, do not arrive at the same conclusion. We must, however, express our regret that any hymn-book should be published, whether by a bishop or by any Christian, in which the name of Jesus or of Christ never occurs; and we have no sympathy with the revising process by which these sacred names should be entirely excluded.

But the question that naturally arises in connexion with this new view which the Bishop of Natal has adopted, is—How can he remain in a church, in the public services of which Christ is worhipped as God; and how can he use the Liturgy and other portions of the service in which prayer is directly addressed to Christ? Here are some of the prayers that are used regularly every Sunday in the Church of England Service:—

"Lord have mercy upon us. Christ have mercy upon us.

"O God the Son, Redeemer of the world: have mercy upon us.

"By the mystery of thy holy Incarnation; by thy holy Nativity and Circumcision; by thy Baptism, Fasting, and Temptation, good Lord deliver us. By thine Agony and Bloody Sweat; by thy

Cross and Passion; by thy precious Death and Burial; by thy glorious Resurrection and Ascension; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, good Lord, deliver us.

"Son of God we beseech thee to hear us.

"O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant us thy peace."

When a Christian has arrived at the conclusion that prayer to Christ is unscriptural, as Bishop Colenso admits in so many words that he has, we believe that no ingenuity of reasoning can justify him in using, Sunday after Sunday, the prayers which we have quoted, and which form part of the ordinary service in every house of worship connected with the Established Church of England; and we are driven to the painful conclusion that one whom we were disposed to admire for the manly and independent course which he pursued, remains in connection with a church to whose worship he conscientiously objects, because he lacks either the courage or the honesty to retire from it.

A SCOTCH PROFESSOR ON THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

THE following extracts from a letter by Professor Blackie, which lately appeared in *The Scotsman*, will be read with interest. They afford unmistakable evidence that the intellectual portion of the Established Church of Scotland is no longer disposed to accept the Westminster Confession as a Rule of Faith:—

. . . "All men who know anything of theology have long looked up to the Scottish Confession of Faith as one of the most masterly among the symbolical books of the Protestant Churches. As an exposition of a Protestant scheme of doctrine, drawn from the Scriptures, as opposed to the sacerdotal pretensions of Popery, it is a most effective document, and will never cease to be regarded by intelligent Christians with the profoundest respect. But what the so-called orthodox party in the Church—though on this point, as one of your correspondents states, there can be no doubt that they are really the heterodox party—what the Church Conservatives, and the Dukes and Duchesses maintain, I understand is, that the Confession of Faith is a rule or form of belief to be imposed without qualification on all the ministers and eldership of the Scottish Presbyterian Church. Now, it is against this claim of the Confession that I join Dr. Muir and a large and growing party of thinking men in this country in entering a most emphatic protest. It is a yoke, to adopt a Scriptural phrase, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear, and which we are determined to

cast off. The time, in fact, has cast it off already, as one of your young correspondents has stated. We are all infected more or less with the so-called "prevailing errors"—that is, with opinions which do not exactly square with the form of sound words which suited the theological needs of the Reformation era. We breathe an atmosphere which is not the atmosphere of the sixteenth century, and we become more large-lunged and broad-chested in spite of ourselves. A man might as well go into the open streets with a farthing candle in his hand and protest against the sun, as endeavour to impose certain chapters of the Westminster Confession of Faith as necessary conditions of thought to the theological mind of the nineteenth century.

. . . "I have already said that I entertain the profoundest respect for the Confession of Faith. But as a scheme of thought, which any well-instructed Christian teacher at the present day should be called to swear to, it is ridiculous. Let us see, as a matter of history, how these Confessions and other symbolical books arose, and what practical purpose they were intended to serve; and a moment's attention will convince any reasonable man that the claim to set them up as a rule of thought to over-ride and supersede the Bible—for to this it practically does come—is preposterous and tyrannous, and to every Protestant Church suicidal. The Romanists, against whom Luther fulminated his protest, stood before the world as the representatives of organised Christianity on the three strong grounds of sacerdotal authority, ecclesiastical ritualism, and Scripture doctrine. Against the first two only, the Protestant protest was made: they were denounced by the Reformers partly as selfish assumptions, and partly as cumbrous decorations which oppressed and cramped the body which they were meant to adorn. But with these manifold assumptions and decorations, the received and universally believed creed of the Christian Church, as it had been accepted from the beginning, was ingrown and inwoven; and unless the protesters could make it plain that, while they denied the extraneous accretions, they preserved the original organic body of Christian doctrine, it was plain that they must lose their cause. The first necessity of every Protestant Church, therefore, was to set forth a distinct articulate statement of the universally received doctrines of the Christian Church, according to the form of conception then current, as their doctrines; and to show how these stood upon the strong ground of Scripture, utterly independent of sacerdotal interpretation or addition. Hence the logical, legal, and business-like form which these documents everywhere assumed. They were justifications of a new and ill-understood—and everywhere, naturally, misunderstood—theological and ecclesiastical position; and, like all justifications, required a certain formality and a detail more like a paper drawn for a disputed case in a law Court than the freedom and breadth that belong to a popular and practical statement of Gospel truth. The purpose they served was, like Magna Charta or the battle of Bannockburn, purely historical: they were adapted to the struggle of the moment, and not in any degree fitted or intended to establish an imperative rule. The object which they were intended to serve was twofold—first, to take from the clergy the right which they

had usurped of thinking, and feeling, and acting in all Christian matters for the laity; and then to secure to the laity the right of free access to the original sources of all Christian truth in the Scriptures. To the attainment of these objects the detailed expositions of Confessions of Faith were altogether ancillary—necessary only in the way of defence to convince the general Christian world and the secular power that the new religious reformers were men, not monsters, Christians, not Turks; and that the real innovators in doctrine were not the Protestants, but the Romanists. Never was battle fought more scientifically, or more successfully. The Romanists were beaten at every point; and, with all impartial thinkers and accurate reasoners, the mist and smoke of Church tradition vanished in a moment before the clear and well-defined brightness of the Protestant Confessions. But what was to be done with these documents after the battle was fought? Not to fall down and worship them, certainly; not to swear by them; not to plant them between Christians and the Bible; but simply to honour them and to respect them, as Englishmen respect Magna Charta, as Scotsmen tread the field of Bannockburn with fire in their blood. But as no Englishman quotes Magna Charta against a Reform Bill, and no Scotsman thinks himself bound to abide by the tactics which gained the battle of Bannockburn in all time coming, so no sane Protestant dreams of being bound in all points by the statement of Christian doctrine drawn up for polemical purposes at Augsburg, or Geneva, or Westminster. Protestants did not renounce Popery for the sake of any Creed or Confession, but for the sake of free Bible reading. To set up a mere historical protest of this kind as an absolute rule for all future thinking, is to sacrifice the cause for which we fought in order that we may establish an idol-worship of the shield which we used in the fight. It is to abuse and pervert a polemical weapon to a purpose for which it was never intended—to a purpose which, as some of your correspondents well remarked, its framers evidently never intended that it should serve. For what says the Confession of Faith, embodied in the second session of the First Scottish Parliament of King William and Mary, holden at Edinburgh on 25th April, 1690, as to its own pretensions? It says distinctly, as all the world ought to know, but more than half the world seems to have forgotten, that '*all Synods or Councils since the Apostles' times may err, and may have erred; therefore they are not to be held the* RULE *of faith or practice, but to be used as a* HELP *in both.*' And yet, in the face of this plain and distinct declaration of the document, fortified as it is by reason, and nature, and common sense, and the divinely-ordained constitution of the human mind and laws of social growth, there is a strong body of men in all the Scottish Churches who have the assurance to charge Principal Tulloch with heresy for doing nothing more than simply re-asserting this plain principle—assuming likewise to themselves, and are, by the ignorance of great part of the public, allowed to assume to themselves, the title of orthodox, while they run right in the teeth of the document which they profess to respect, and claim the right to change a useful help into an imperative rule; to make a tyrannical master out of a clever servant; and to elevate a schoolmaster into an oracle. Such absur-

dities are perpetrated nowhere that I know, with a certain air of plausibility, except in Christian Church Courts.

"Here, then, is the impregnable position which the large-hearted and large-viewed theology of the present day is entitled to assume. The real heterodox in this affair are those who style themselves orthodox. And they are heterodox men and heretics of the worst kind; they are traitors to the proper soul and spirit of the Protestantism which they profess. They are Protestants only in the letter. They have disowned the authority of the priest; but only that they may clothe the Presbyter with his usurped attribute of infallibility. For we are not to be judged at this time of day by mere phrases and professions. Whosoever sets up the Confession of Faith, not as a useful help, but as an imperative rule of faith, and judges his brother accordingly, that man, whatever he may profess, practically believes himself infallible, and has re-established Popery in a new form. The man who plants his dogma or his articles between any Christian man and the free study of the Christian Scriptures, is living and acting in the spirit of Popery as much as the Puseyite who imposes his ritualism on the freed conscience of Christendom. But there are some other considerations with respect to this matter worthy of being pressed. It seems to me, after many years' pondering of the subject, that the time is perhaps now come for dispensing with Confessions of Faith altogether in theological teaching, even as a 'help.' I have already stated that, in my Biblical studies, I found them rather a hindrance than a help; and I cannot imagine what intellectual or moral loss I should suffer if they were all burned to-morrow. The value of these documents depends altogether upon their living relation to the times; and no one, who knows anything of the present age, will imagine that there is any such relation between the theological systems of the seventeenth century and the processes of thought which are now being everywhere evolved. The form of the Confession of Faith is essentially scholastic. The literary form of those days was pervaded throughout with scholasticism. A man cannot take up even a pious discourse of the noble young martyr Renwick, without feeling the angles and prickles of that strange old form going rudely into his flesh. Not only so, but scholasticism and abstract form of every kind are things foreign much more even to the genius of the Gospel than to the spirit of the century in which we live. To formalise Christianity under logical divisions and strict metaphysical definitions is certainly not to preach the truth as it was originally preached either to the Jews on the Mount of Beatitudes or to the Greeks on the Hill of Mars. The Bible, however unlike Homer in almost every other respect, is like him in this, that it is the most unscholastic book ever written. It deals in fervid appeal to conscience, fearless assertion of fact, and vivid pictures of human nature; but not at all in theological definitions. St. Paul, indeed, in his polemical position, had sometimes to state a doctrine and formally discuss a theme; but the preaching of Christ is never argumentative. To thrust forward an artificial system of doctrine, therefore, into the van of Christian instruction, is certainly not to preach the Gospel in the tone and manner in which it was originally preached. It is to create a false issue. It

is to challenge a logical contest where a moral conviction is the thing needed. It is to excite the hearer to refute your bad arguments, instead of moving him to reform his own bad manners. It is a great practical blunder, and a great moral incongruity. In the Easter service of the English Church, there is nothing to me more truly Christian than the Easter hymn sung on that occasion; nothing more anti-Christian than the Athanasian Creed, which is then also publicly read. Why? Because devout emotion, arising out of the fact of the resurrection of Christ, is the very central life-pulse of Christianity, as any man may see in the Epistles of Paul; while a formal dogmatic assertion of doctrine, in such a form as at once to challenge reason and outrage charity, is altogether opposed to the whole spirit and manner of the original preachers of the Gospel. I for one could as soon imagine Plato writing an article in the *Westminster Review*, as I could figure St. Paul reading the Athanasian Creed. The cool, damnatory dogmatism which distinguishes that document—and which taints, more or less, all Creeds and Confessions, from the Nicene downwards—is the very last style of utterance which I could imagine dropping from the lips either of the Apostles, or of Him whose message they delivered.

"So much for the inconsistencies, incongruities, and absurdities involved in setting up a symbolical book as an imperative rule of faith. But there is something worse than mere logical inconsistencies: there are practical consequences, inevitably resulting from the insisting on such perverse principles at the present hour, of which the Churches have been duly warned by Principal Tulloch, and on which, therefore, it is unnecessary that I should enlarge. The fact is, that no Church maintaining such monstrous doctrines can stand in an age of general inquiry and intellectual independence; no Church can in these days stake its existence on mere authority: Popery in all shapes is doomed, whether with a scarlet robe or with a black gown. To attempt to live divorced from the intelligence of the age—as ecclesiastical conceit has done at Rome, and may be fated to do in Edinburgh—is to sign the death-warrant of the Church which makes the attempt. God is not mocked in such matters: it is His will that there shall be growth, and variety, and expansion in His world; and no obstinacy of a club of ossified figures of Churchmen swearing by a piece of paper may ever acquire virtue to prevent it. Either the Church must grow along with the age, or the age will grow away from the Church; only the living have power over the living: there is an unsleeping march in the processes of time, which no one can hope to stay by pointing to the statues of dead kings."

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

From the Annual Report of this Association, which has been published in the *Monthly Journal* for July and August, we make the following extracts, bearing on subjects that have been much discussed by Unitarians on this side of the Atlantic:—

Want of Ministers.—"As regards the help which this Association

can render in filling the ranks of the ministry, we counsel liberality in affording pecuniary aid to those who need it, while pursuing their education. But we would advise a careful exercise of this liberality. We would not give aid to those who, much as they may find it convenient, can do without it: not only because this is taking from those who need it more, but because the receiving of aid, though entirely consistent with true manliness when the need is real, is likely, if indulged without such absolute necessity, to engender a spirit of dependence which is a blight on the character, and is almost the only evil quality which the ministry, as a profession, is said peculiarly to foster. And, secondly, we would only bestow aid upon those whom it is really advisable to encourage. We think there are many who have entered the ministry, and failed, who would have been eminently useful in other pursuits, and who would have been blessed by any hindrance or discouragement which should have turned them away. With these points of caution, we deem it one of the best uses of our money to aid young men in preparing for the ministry; and it is worthy of consideration also, whether it may not be expedient to afford this aid, not only to those who are theological students, but to those who are in their preparatory studies, and who have a fitness and an inclination for the ministry."

Our Denominational Position.—In England, some of the most prominent men of our body are strenuously advocating the relinquishment of our distinctive name, in order to secure a broader position. There are many in our own country who sympathise with such a desire. The matter has been practically brought to our consideration by the fact, that in almost every new movement towards the establishment of a Society, especially at the West, the gathering is composed not only of professed Unitarians, but of members of other branches of the Liberal Church; and it is natural to wish to satisfy the predilections of these, by organizing under some comprehensive name. Accordingly, in many instances, even where the Unitarian element has been the strongest, and where all the aid needed from without has come from this Association, the name "Unitarian" has been waived, and they have organized as an "Independent" church. In almost every such instance, the result has been unfortunate. Not only has there been a temptation to forfeit that positive character which is the essential requisite to religious edification, but misunderstandings and divisions, and signs of narrowness, have arisen,—such as could never have occurred if our distinct name and government had been assumed, with the broad freedom and comprehensive spirit which its policy includes. And our experience has convinced us that, even if we look only to the securing of the broadest Christian liberty, we shall be led to a more distinct and steady adherence to our own denominational independence. We recognize with the largest sympathy all branches of the Liberal Church, of whatever name. We have usually refrained from entering places where one of them had pre-occupied the ground, unless there was room for both; and have encouraged the Unitarians to join the other movement, and be satisfied with that. In all the enterprises with which we have

been concerned, we have encouraged such a course that it shall be understood of us, that, while positive and earnest in our Christian faith and purpose, there shall be no Church where more perfect liberty is found. We would not be *exclusive*, but, to the largest degree consistent with an earnest faith, *inclusive*. Further than this we do not think it well at present to go. The time may come when a different course may be desirable; but now we believe that our true course is not to yield, but to preserve and to strengthen our distinctive position!

"The times are pregnant with new systems, all tending towards liberal ideas, each characterized and designated by some particular phase of experience and thought; while there is the great mass of the unchurched, some time to be reached by a rational faith, but not yet roused from the indifference which has been the first result of the breaking away from rejected creeds, and therefore now attached to no system, but nebulous and undefined. We concur in the belief and prayer, that, in the great Church of the Future, these may all be one. But, in order to this, the true course is not for each of the forming bodies or systems to dissolve itself into the nebula! The course of development is not in the direction of nebulosity. It is rather for each of the systems to strengthen its own cohesiveness and importance. Then, whichever one of them it be that has in it the best elements of permanence and attractiveness, to that both the other systems and the nebula itself will gravitate, till it shall absorb, and, in turn, be modified by, all the rest. The union will not be nebulous, but compact of all! Or, what if the result shall be, that, considering the differences of tastes and temperaments and habits of thought, a diversity is needed, and so the systems never merge, but remain distinct? It will only be following the analogy of the natural universe; it will not be inconsistent with true harmony: only, this will not be that of uniformity or identity, but like the harmony of the spheres! In regard to the name 'Unitarian,' we have no such blind attachment to it as to fail to perceive, that many better names could be chosen; and, indeed, we should be unwilling to adhere to it, if we must accept its inherent meaning as a type or expression of our position. But, as with all other names, its etymology or analysis is nothing. *If it is the name for us as a religious body, then (just as if it were any other word) it means whatever we are or come to be.* There may have been a time when the name was a hindrance. Now it certainly has become a power; and not only have we no reason to be ashamed of its associations and its history ourselves, but we believe that under it, better than under any other, we can now go on to our work and our victories for God and the truth!"

THE GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCHES.

The proceedings of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches, held in May last, have been published; they afford much information respecting the condition of the several congregations connected with the denomination. The Rev. J. C. Means, in

his report as a Messenger, refers to the history of the churches, and attributes their present unsatisfactory state to the prominence which, for half a century, has been given to what he terms "the Unitarian Movement," by which he explains that he does not mean the introduction of the doctrine of Divine Unity, but "the change which brought this doctrine and the theology then connected with it to the front, and which led the churches which embraced the movement to regard the promotion of that theology as their great work, and to devote all their energies to it." We make the following extract:—

"The spirit which thus influenced our Churches was essentially critical and negative, prone to reject and to dwell upon its disbeliefs. Its appeal was to the intellect, not to the affections. For our disbeliefs cannot touch our affections, or raise us towards God. At best, they can only preserve us from some misleading influences, to which we should else be subject. They cannot kindle any holy warmth of soul: and the result of this predominance of the negative spirit was a religious coldness, which hastened our downfall, and has mainly contributed to bring us to our present state.

"It is true that the spirit which animated the movement at its origin, and for many years afterwards, has, in later times, been largely modified, and in some respects beneficially. Channing has dethroned Priestley and Belsham, and few revolutions have been more rapid and complete: he has left them little more than a name. Theological students may read their works, but not the people. Of the numerous tracts that Dr. Priestley and his contemporaries wrote, so familiar to my early recollection, you hardly now meet with one in circulation, and it is rarely that their titles occur in the catalogues of our Societies. You may find them on the cobwebbed shelves of an ancient library, as you find the fossil remains of bygone creatures in the cases of a museum. But Channing himself is yielding his throne, and the spirit of Theodore Parker is fast, I apprehend, gaining the ascendant.

"To a considerable extent, the change which was effected in this country by Channing was religious. If it did not originate in, it was at least aided by, the sense of religious want and the craving of religious feeling. The more recent change is far less favourable to the development of the religious spirit. Indeed, its antisupernaturalism will be, I believe, fatal to it. By denying the supernatural in our Lord's history, interwoven as it is inextricably with his teachings and works, they destroy the credibility of the ancient records of his life, which are the source of all we know of him, and thus blur over his image in our mind, and most seriously impair, if they do not entirely destroy, its influence on our souls. Again, the denial of all special intervention, though limited at first to the material universe, will necessarily be extended to the spiritual; and the stainless holiness and moral completeness of our Lord's character will become as incredible as his marvellous works, being equally incompatible with the ordinary working of the laws of causation. And the belief in the direct communion of the soul with God will fade away, as at variance with all the analogies of the natural world."

INTELLIGENCE.

FREE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, NEW SWINDON.

On Sunday, July 29th, the Rev. F. R. Young completed the *fifth* year of his ministry in the above place of worship, and after a sermon in the evening from John iv. 37, addressed the congregation in the following words:—

And now, friends, with these words, and the close of the present service, we bring ourselves to the end of another year's existence as a society of Christian worshippers. When a portion of the Jewish people returned from Babylon, the poet, who sang of that return, said that "they were like them that dream." And when you and I look back over the five years through the Sabbaths of which we have met in this place, and remember that we met first of all as total strangers to each other, it might well seem to us, so swift is the passage of time, and so intense our experience, to be something like a dream of the night through which we have been passing. And yet no figure of speech could more entirely misrepresent our case than the figure of a dream, for at least we have been alive and working, joying and sorrowing, hoping and fearing, and fighting and conquering; while we have known, often painful enough, everything about ourselves, and what was going on round about us. No, our five years have not been a dream, but a very earnest reality. In many a home in this town, and in hearts far away from hence, lies the testimony that our hours have been waking ones, devoted to working and waiting, and not to the rest and quiet of sleep.

To some who are not associated with us, and who stand aside looking on with a puzzled curiosity, and to others who notice us, but quite as much to criticize us as for any other object, it must be a difficult thing to estimate us rightly. Compelled by our most living convictions to separate ourselves, to some extent, from the Christian churches that cluster around us, and separated from them still more widely than we could desire, because they are unwilling to co-operate with us upon any basis; with no sectarian name, and no man-made creed to bind us, some wonder why we believe so much, and so steadfastly profess our highest allegiance to Christ, while others blame us for believing too little, and are surprised that we should dare to take upon ourselves the holy name of Christ, and still more that we should celebrate that simple rite which for 1800 years has been observed in remembrance of the world's Redeemer. Now, it is by no means, and in itself, a pleasant thing to be misunderstood, and, as a natural consequence, misrepresented. But it is, nevertheless, our simple duty not to attempt the impossible task of convincing those who will not listen to any words we may have to say, or of conciliating those who content themselves with being passive critics, but to do our own work in simplicity and godly sincerity, because it is every man's duty to live the truth he knows, and to work for its spread in the minds and hearts of others. It may be that some portion of that

which we esteem to be truth is, nevertheless, error, and that we are actually doing evil when we most desire to do good. God alone can solve such difficulties. But we, fallible and foolish as we are, can always know "what manner of spirit we are of," and whether, knowing the truth, we desire to live it, and make our worshipping society a living centre of living work for others. If we had consulted our own outward peace and comfort, intending to purchase, at any cost, the smiles of our fellows and avoid their frowns,—if we had made up our minds to sail with the stream, and do what others do, and be as others are, and say what others say, we should never have assembled here upon the liberal conditions which now unite us. But, pleasant as quiet and rest are, faithful endeavour is still more pleasant; and beautiful as peace is, fidelity to conscience is still more beautiful. We may be outcasts from the surrounding churches, and yet belong to the "general assembly and church of the First Born;" we may be denied by others the right to use the name of Christian, but only our own unfaithfulness can ever rob us of the realities which that name represents; and we may have to work alone, but it can be our comfort to remember One who himself "trod the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with him"—who failed, to outward seeming, when he succeeded most really,—and who, "despised and rejected" in the days of his flesh, is now the acknowledged King of the civilized world. Once "he was dead, but now he liveth, and behold he is alive for evermore," to teach and inspire every willing disciple of his, who will share his work and give himself up to the guidance of his spirit. That Redeemer, that Saviour, that Teacher, that Guide, that Inspirer, is ours the very moment we are willing to have him, and we may be quite sure that just as we follow in his footsteps, and suffer him to lead us by the hand, no good thing will be withheld from us. Therefore, with honest regret for every failing, and modest judgment upon our work, we would humbly place our five years' history at the feet of God, knowing that we ought to feel gratitude to Him for all the past and that we may cherish hope in Him for the future. Time, which works wonders, will, we believe, work for us the reversal of many an unjust sentence now passed upon us, while it will bring to our aid some who are now indifferent to us, or actually oppose us. With no selfish tears for what could not have been avoided, and no foolish hopes of good in the future, which may never be realized, let us pass on, asking God to bless us in the time which may lie before us, as He has blessed us in the time which lies behind us, while we cherish a deep desire to be more faithful and earnest than we have been. *Faithful*, I say, not successful. It is *not* given to man to ensure the measure of success he may desire, or to give to that success the form which he may think it ought to take. But it *is* given to him to be faithful in the temple, the home, the shop, the street,—faithful to himself, to God, and his fellow-creatures,—faithful to the duty which asks to be done, and to the trial which must needs be borne. And of this be sure, that you and I have only to be "steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for our labour not to be in vain in the Lord." And should it be our happy lot,

as I am sure it is our duty and privilege, to be "faithful unto death," to us, even to us, the condemned and outcast, shall be given "a crown of life," by the pierced hands of a crucified Saviour, whom God has given to man to be man's "Way, and Truth, and Life," and through whom the race will finally come to know the Father to be "the only true God, and Jesus to be the Christ whom He hath sent."

On the following Sunday, August 5, the Rev. Robert Spears, of London, preached two able and interesting sermons, and at the conclusion of the evening service administered the Lord's Supper. On Monday evening a tea meeting was held in the School-room. After tea a public meeting was held in the Church, the Rev. F. R. Young presiding. The chairman referred to the history of the Congregation through the five years of its existence, and concluded by expressing his gratitude for the past, and a cheerful hope for the future. The Rev. R. Spears said it had given him much pleasure to visit Swindon, about the Free Christian cause in which place he and many other friends had heard, and in the success of which so many away from Swindon were deeply interested. In the name of those friends he wished them God speed, and congratulated them upon their prosperity. Their platform was a broad one, for a man might become a member of their Church without being subjected to an inquisition as to his theological opinions. If he desired to lead the Christian life, and receive Christ as his Master, he would be accepted without hesitation. They should strive to build up their cause by being "living epistles, read and known by all men," by co operating with their minister in all possible ways, and by showing a kindly spirit to such as might occasionally visit their Church. The Rev. J. A. Brinkworth, and Messrs. P. Henrette and W. L. Fallows also spoke, and the proceedings closed with the passing of a vote of thanks to Mr. Spears; and also to the choir, who, in the course of the evening, sang several anthems.

NORTHUMBERLAND AND DURHAM DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this Association was held at the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle, on Monday evening, August 20. There was a good attendance of those interested in the mission cause. After tea, the business meeting was held; the Rev. J. C. Street presided. The Chairman said their meeting that night was a purely business gathering for conference on matters affecting the welfare of their missions. Mr. Samuel Cooper, one of the Secretaries, read the report of the Committee, which gave an interesting account of the progress of the work of the Association at Sunderland, Middlesbro', Jarrow, and other centres of population, and showed that there was much reason for encouragement in what had been effected. After the Treasurer's statement of accounts had been submitted, and several resolutions bearing on the mission had been passed, the Chairman sought the counsel of those present respecting their future proceedings. An animated conversation followed, in which a number of those present joined, and they

seemed unanimous in recommending tract distribution, visiting, out-door preaching, and the opening of new mission stations. The Chairman, in bringing the meeting to a close, said—"God has laid upon us great duties and responsibilities. Truth has been given to us to practice and to preach. Our own hearts must be transformed by the Spirit of God, and then we shall be able to speak to others with a constraining and resistless power. But we must have more piety—more love to God—more love for our brethren; there must come upon us a more solemn sense of our great trust, and a more intense earnestness of purpose, before we can look for a Pentecostal blessing upon our labours. Gladly shall I respond to the call of this conference, and try to find more numerous centres of usefulness for you. There seems to be a hunger for work, an overpowering desire to be employed in the large and noble service of God. Be it my purpose and endeavour to give your desires full room for exercise. I trust ere long to find spheres of usefulness for you all. But, oh my brethren, we must go to this work with solemn consideration of spirit; we must lay ourselves in the hand of God, wait for the inspirations that come from His Spirit, and then, in the Spirit of Christ—the spirit of love, of fidelity, and of sacrifice—go out to our exalted work." The proceedings were terminated by prayer.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Southern Unitarian and the Southern Unitarian Fund Societies was held at Newbury, on August 8. The Rev. E. Talbot preached from 1 Cor. iii. 11, on "Christ the only true foundation." The business meeting was afterwards held, the Rev. C. Mathews in the chair. The Rev. E. Kell read the reports of the two Societies. John T. Hart, Esq., of London, attended as a deputation from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. In the evening, a meeting was held in the chapel, at which the Revds. C. Mathews, E. Kell, E. Talbot, J. Naylor, and H. Hawkes spoke.

LAY PREACHERS' UNION, LONDON.

On Sunday, July 29, this Society commenced operations by opening two stations.—St. John's Chapel, West Street, Walworth, and the Academy, Church Street, Arlington Square, Hoxton. The attendance at both places was good. The Rev. R. Spears inaugurated the movement at Walworth, and the Rev. J. Taylor the one at Hoxton, but the future work in both will mainly be carried on by the lay preachers themselves.

SUNDAY SCHOOL ENTERTAINMENTS.

Moneyrea.—On Thursday, July 19, the teachers and scholars of the Sunday School in connexion with the Non-Subscribing Congregation of Moneyrea, held their anniversary. At one o'clock they assembled in the Meeting-house, where the Rev. J. Jellie, of Belfast, conducted a religious service, and gave an excellent address to the young people. They then adjourned to a neighbouring

field, and engaged in various innocent amusements. Tea was provided at four o'clock, and the proceedings were brought to a close shortly after seven, by a few words from the Rev. D. Thompson, the pastor of the congregation.

KILLINCHY.—The Sunday School in connexion with the Remonstrant Congregation, Killinchy, held their anniversary on Tuesday, July 24th. The children congregated in the Meeting-house at twelve o'clock, when an interesting and useful address was delivered to them by the Rev. John Jellie, Belfast. After the address, the children, accompanied by a large number of friends, proceeded to the lawn of Mrs. Watson, where various juvenile games were commenced. Ample refreshments, in the way of buns, cakes, and lemonade, were provided for the occasion. Towards the evening a psalm was sung, and prayer was offered up by the Rev. John Orr, Comber; and, on the motion of the Rev. John M'Caw, a cordial vote of thanks was passed to Mrs. Watson for her kindness in offering the accommodation of her lawn, and otherwise contributing to the enjoyment of the meeting.

CRUMLIN.—On Wednesday, August 8, a soiree was held in the Meeting-house of the First Presbyterian Congregation, Crumlin, for the purpose of entertaining the Sunday School children, and also of paying a compliment to the congregational choir. Prayer having been offered up, an assemblage of more than four hundred persons, of various denominations, partook of tea and its accompaniments, which were bountifully supplied. The Rev. R. Cleland, minister of the Congregation, was afterwards moved to the chair, and opened the proceedings with a few appropriate remarks. He then introduced the Rev. J. M'Fadden, of Ballyclare, who addressed the Sunday School children in an earnest and impressive speech, in which he dwelt on the advantages of the Sunday School, on the importance of regular attendance, and on the sacredness of the work in which the teachers were engaged, and he concluded by a complimentary reference to the choir, whose services the congregation so justly appreciated. The Rev. T. Bowring, of Belfast, afterwards gave an interesting and instructive address. "Our Brethren of other Denominations" was happily responded to by Dr. Hume, "The Ladies," by Mr. Thomas M'Ervel, and "The Stewards," by Mr. John Christie. The entertainment was agreeably diversified by several hymns, which were effectively sung in the course of the evening; and, after a vote of thanks had been passed, on the motion of Mr. William M'Ervel, to the ministers and other friends from a distance, the proceedings were closed with a hymn and prayer.

OBITUARY.

Died, on August 14, at Hill House, Newry, Miss Matilda Bowles.

Died, on August 22, at Holywood, Anne Montgomerie, relict of the late James Black, Esq., and daughter of the late Charles Dickey, Esq., Millmount, Randalstown.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] OCTOBER, 1866. [No. 9.

MOTIVES AND OBSTACLES TO UNITARIAN MISSIONS.

CHRISTIANITY was, some eighteen centuries ago, confined to a small strip of land on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, and even there was held and professed only by a small portion of the people, while the great majority, Gentile as well as Jew, regarded it either with hostility or indifference. "Go yo into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," was the solemn command which the Saviour addressed to his chosen followers before his ascension to the Father; and, faithful to the word of their Master, those devoted disciples laboured incessantly to disseminate the blessed truths which had cheered and sanctified their own hearts. In the progress of time, through the persevering efforts and untiring zeal of a few, the good news which the Son of God had revealed was widely published, and was largely received. Power and prejudice gradually yielded to the force of truth, and not only in Jordan, but in Greece and Rome, and in many countries of Asia, Jesus was accepted as the Christ, and thousands submitted to his gentle yoke. The growth of Christian truth was strikingly foreshadowed and illustrated by the parable of the mustard seed—at first so small, but gradually growing into a spreading tree; and by the leaven which by little and little pervaded the whole lump. The early Christians were obviously missionaries; they felt that the truth had been committed to them, not merely for the enlightenment of their own mind and the sanctification of their own heart and life, but also, that through their influence and efforts it might be imparted to others, and thus universally diffused. Christians have, through successive ages, continued to be missionaries. Often the

truth was misapprehended; error, in one form or another, grew up and destroyed the purity and simplicity of Christ's Gospel; compulsion took the place of persuasion, and the degenerate successors of the first disciples sought to extend the kingdom of Christ, not by argument and entreaty, but by the dungeon, the fagot, and the sword. We admit that one grave error respecting those who had not embraced Christianity, gave an impetus to the violent and unlawful efforts which were thus made to extend Christendom—an error which still, when such violent proceedings have been long abandoned, imparts to many much of the zeal which they entertain for the conversion of the heathen—we mean the belief that all who are in ignorance of the Gospel sink, at death, into irremediable and eternal torments. But, apart from a belief which clashes so terribly with every sentiment of mercy and justice, and which would represent God as essentially cruel, there is, in most Christian Churches, a large missionary spirit; and hence Roman Catholics and Protestants expend much wealth, and labour, and self-sacrifice for the spread of their Christian views among the heathens of almost every country and island of the globe, among the Israelites scattered over Europe, and among the practically heathen that crowd the lanes and courts of our populous towns. Christians derive help, and comfort, and peace, from the religion of Christ, and, actuated by a Christian spirit, they seek to share such blessings with their less favoured brethren.

We are not disposed at present to examine the missionary schemes sustained by the several denominations of Christians. Although in some respects they are open to criticism and censure, they have yet accomplished some, we might be safe in saying much, good; and the disinterestedness of the efforts and sacrifices by which these schemes have been carried on is in beautiful harmony with the Gospel of Christ. While Unitarians dissent from certain dogmas which have grown up in the Church, but for which they can find no authority in the Gospel,—dogmas which, in their mind, destroy the simplicity of the Gospel and reflect on the holiest attributes of God,—they do not object to the spirit among

their Christian brethren which prompts them thus to labour in the cause of their Master, but, on the contrary, admire and commend it. Whatever of Christian truth any disciple or any church holds, they are bound alike by the word and spirit of their Lord to communicate, as far as they can, to others. All, we presume, will admit that Unitarians are bound, no less than their Trinitarian fellow-Christians, to labour and pray for the spread of the Gospel; and, inasmuch as they believe that their views of Christ's Word are most rational, elevating, consolatory, and sanctifying, they should the more ardently seek to propagate them. A man who believes the truth himself, and feels how precious it is, will seek to impart it to others; and so with a church. Perhaps we might measure, not the truth of a Church's creed, but the value which its members attach to it, by their labours for its extension. And if we believe that we hold religious truths which the Saviour, sent from God, revealed to the world—truths which are precious for time and for eternity—we should labour to disseminate them by every means in our power. Although Unitarians do not believe in the damnation of all heathens, they yet believe that Christianity brings much spiritual light and strength to its disciples, and that it is not only elevating and comforting, but that it is also, in a sense which we may not fully apprehend, *saving* to those who receive and obey it. It is obvious, therefore, that Unitarians have the strongest motives urging them to engage in Missionary labours.

But there are obstacles which, once inconsiderable, have recently assumed an alarming magnitude. Formerly there was little diversity of opinion among those who bore the Unitarian name, and the exposition of Unitarianism given by its leading advocates, as Channing, Ware, Eliot, Peabody, Carpenter, Yates, Porter, and others, was essentially the same, and generally accepted by the church as its *creed*, or, if any dislike the word creed, as *its belief*. But now all such expositions and statements are spurned by many who have enrolled themselves in the Unitarian ranks—by some who have charge of Unitarian pulpits: and if an inquirer now-a-days seeks to know what is meant by Unitarian Christianity, he is

baffled at almost every point. He soon finds that Unitarians do not believe in the Trinity, in the Deity of Him who died on the cross, or in a *vicarious* atonement; but those are only so many negations. What, he endeavours to learn, do they believe? Do they receive the Bible as embodying a Divine Revelation? Not all. Do they believe in the Divine Mission of Christ? No; not all. Do they believe in Christ's resurrection? Many of them do; but it is not an article of their belief. What, then, the impatient inquirer may demand—what do they *all* believe? And the only answer that could truthfully be given is that they believe in a God—for so far, we think there are no atheists among them—in a future life, and in the value of goodness. But Christianity is something more than that bald belief. It was not such a faith that warmed the soul, and beautified and sanctified the life of John, and Peter, and Paul; nor is it such a faith that will kindle a missionary zeal, or foster a Christian spirit in the heart of modern Unitarians. It is evident that Unbelief has fastened itself on our church, and is gradually extinguishing its Christian faith, crushing out its Christian life.

With principles so undefined and undefinable; without *a creed*, which, in this case, means without *a definite belief*, how can any Missionary work be undertaken? Before we presume to instruct others, we must determine what it is we mean to teach. Now, we read of various Missionary Societies connected with the Unitarian denomination in Great Britain. There is one, we believe, in the South of England. What its operations are we have little means of knowing; but we presume that ministers visit districts in which there is no stated pastor, and preach to as many as they can gather together. Let us suppose that the venerable pastor of The Conigree, Trowbridge, visits such a station, and, in his own simple and earnest manner, brings before his auditors the mission and work of Christ as they are exhibited in the Holy Scriptures. Next Lord's day may come another Unitarian minister, who preaches in a different strain, ignoring the authority of Scripture, representing the Bible as "fetish," the resurrection of Jesus as a farce, and uprooting, as far as zeal for unbelief can, the good

seed which his predecessor had sown. There is a missionary organization connected with the Unitarian Body in the North of England,—perhaps we err in saying that it is a Unitarian Body, for a Doctor of Divinity, who is one of its leading members, stated, on a public occasion, that they admit all comers, never asking what any man's opinions are! As a matter to be expected, there are ministers and laymen of all shades of liberal thought among them, from the "old Unitarian" to the "advanced" liberal and the outspoken Deist. What missionary work can such a motley assembly carry on? What good can they possibly accomplish, unless it be in the way of moral reform, about which, let their differences in doctrine be what they may, we believe they are all heartily united. But, with such obstacles to united missionary labour, it is folly to engage in it for the spread of Christ's Gospel.

In Ireland similar obstacles exist, although none of the ministers have, so far as we know, avowed sceptical opinions. We believe that they would not agree respecting the Christian principles they should advocate; and if they engaged to supply any missionary station, doctrines might be preached on one Sunday directly at variance with those which had been propounded on the previous one. In the opinion of many, judging from their repeated declarations, the "one thing needful" is *liberty;* and even here they are not agreed, for some are satisfied with *Christian*, and others stand up for *absolute* liberty.

Are matters to continue in this anomalous and wretched state? Let those who are united in a firm belief in the mission and authority of Christ from God, and in the value of such a faith to the world, unite for Christian work, disentangling themselves from those whose loose opinions chill their zeal or bring discredit on their cause; and Christian Unitarianism may yet recover from the injuries it has sustained, and nobly vindicate its claims to be regarded as a living portion of the Church of Christ.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

BY REV. A. P. PUTNAM, OF BROOKLYN.

"Having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."—1 Tim. iv. 8.

The life that is to come! What grander and more solemn theme can engage the human mind than this? What subject has for us so profound and thrilling an interest? Beyond the veil that is suspended just before us and that limits the mortal view, stretches out the vast, spiritual, eternal world. Thither the countless myriads who have lived and died on the earth have gone. Many who were dearer to us than our very life, have crossed the boundary-line and entered the mysterious domain. And we ourselves, gifted with immortality as they, are also moving constantly and irresistibly on to the same great destination, and shall soon be there. That unseen stupendous realm where are gathered so many of the heart's best treasures, whither have gone forth the multitudinous hopes and fears, the deepest dreads and longings of all who have peopled the earth, and whence, of the innumerable millions who have passed into the solemn silence, not one has returned to tell us of what he has there seen, and heard, and felt—that invisible and boundless realm—how in our very souls we do yearn to know its mysteries and behold its wonders! "What shall we be and where, when the brief, vanishing life that now is shall be ended?" is the deep, affecting inquiry which all of us not seldom address to ourselves, even amidst the crowding cares and vanities of our daily experience. There is no interrogatory that is so important, so momentous to us in its meaning and solution, as this. None which it is so profitable and well to consider, and also, so far as we can or may, to answer.

Yet how little it is that we can really know with certainty about the future world! Successive generations—the purest and most gifted of the race—have sought to peer into the great unknown and tell its secrets; but in vain. How crude, absurd, ridiculous, seem to us now many of the theories of the life to come which they have formed, and which, it may be, have held no very

limited sway over the minds of men! Even the last desperate attempt of the popular mind to penetrate the awful veil and make familiar to us the things that are hidden beyond it, has ended in failure. Modern Spiritualism has revealed to us no new truth. It has given us nothing which we did not know before. Our refuge, after all, is mainly in the Scriptures. There lies the world's great comfort still. And yet, even there, while there is so much to animate and satisfy the soul, how many an earnest inquiry and searching gaze fail of their answering object! For some wise and good reason God has purposely left us to know only in part and to walk by faith. By the study of the word of God, by the exercise of the reason, and by the help of the hints and analogies of nature and of life, it is given us to behold enough to encouruge us to continue steadfastly and joyfully that walk by faith, until at last we shall walk by sight, and know even as also we are known.

Still it may truly be said that as time has rolled on, no little progress has been made in just and rational conceptions of life and destiny. It seems to us, in such an age as this, strange and almost incredible that such horrible views of this subject should ever have long and extensively prevailed in the world as have really constituted an essential part of the religious faith of the ages, and exerted their baleful influence upon unnumbered multitudes of souls. Heaven has been believed to be a vast, separate, localized region—an immense and glorious city, perhaps—situated far up, as it were, at the zenith of the universe, and enriched with walls of jasper, gates of pearl, and streets of gold; and hell has been conceived of as a deep and awful lake of burning fire and brimstone, at the nadir of the universe, or in the centre of the earth, where all who die in a state of impenitence and sin are tormented with inconceivable agonies for ever and ever. The Christian world have generally believed in the resurrection of the fleshly body at what they have called the last great day, when they have supposed that Christ would visibly come in his glory, attended by angels, and would summon before his judgment-seat the awakened world of immortals, to sentence to heaven the righteous, and the wicked to hell. They have thought of the

eternal state of both classes of men as thus unalterably fixed at death—the one to be then and for ever entirely and perfectly happy; the other to be then and for ever entirely and perfectly miserable. They have recognized no destined life of aspiration and progress for the former; no possible chance of repentance and recovery for the latter. The present alone, they have thought, is the season of probation and opportunity. Beyond the veil God's moral government changes, and God is changed himself. His ear is everlastingly closed to the cry of his sorrowing, suffering children, as it comes borne up to him on the hot, ascending flame and breath of the pit; while it is open only to the resounding praises, the rapturous exultations of the redeemed around his throne. Here in the life that now is, God is love; there in the life that is to come, he is a consuming fire.

All such views of the future world and the divine administration of affairs, as it stands related to it, seem to us gross, irrational, and false, alike abhorrent to the best reason and higher instincts of the soul, and derogatory to the character and revealed truth of God.

Heaven and hell are not distant, separate, localized regions, somewhere in the mighty universe of God, but are states or conditions of the soul.

Heaven—it is the kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. It is a kingdom that is not outward, but spiritual. "The kingdom of God is within you." When one through faith in Christ's truth, through obedience to his divine precepts, and through a faithful imitation of his example and life, enters into a conscious state of purity, rectitude, and blessedness—when thus he comes to feel that he is in harmony with God as well as with himself, and that he has a sure inward rest which the world cannot give or take away—he enters into heaven. Heaven, therefore, is here in the life that now is, as well as in that which is to come. The Christian on earth has already begun to taste its joys and satisfactions. As in all the interminable future that lies before him he makes progress in the divine way, he will come to know more and more largely the measure of its power and happiness. Yet it is true that here and now he is in heaven, and as long as he lives the life of faith and holi-

ness he cannot lose the glorious boon that has been given him. Go where he may—whatever the sorrows and sufferings he may be called upon to endure, be it earthly loss or domestic bereavement, the prisoner's dungeon or the martyr's flame—he is still in heaven, since God is approvingly with him, and Christ's benediction is upon him, and conscience whispers its words of peace and promise—as when Paul and Silas, incarcerated within gloomy walls in Philippi, prayed and sang praises at midnight to God.

Nor is hell the vast, yawning, visible gulf of despair and woe which the Christian world has so widely believed it to be. It is not an outward region of darkness; not a bottomless pit; not a place of torment into which embodied or disembodied souls are to be thrust and punished for ever. Hell, like heaven, is a state or condition of the soul, and it is a state or condition that is experienced here just as surely as it may be experienced hereafter. Hell is eternal discord and unrest. It is sin in the soul, quenching its holy light, filling it with impurity and disease, weakening its celestial power, demoralizing its glorious functions, torturing it with the stings of remorse, and leaving it without God or without hope in the world. Think of the multitudes who throng our streets, or fill the haunts of vice and shame in a city like this, and who are given over to a life of vanity and crime; who are the victims of every inordinate lust and affection; who are brutalized by the unrestrained indulgence of every bad thought of the mind and passion of the heart; whose countenances are lurid and scarred with the baleful fires of cruelty, hate, jealousy, and revenge; whose homes are the perpetual scenes of violence, wrong, and depravity, where only are heard the voices of jest, anger and profanity, and all knowledge, and love, and pursuit of heavenly things are utter strangers for ever—and say, if, in all this ignorance, filth, blasphemy, inhumanity, and woe, there is not a present and actual hell on earth, which is most fitly described in the vivid and terrible imagery by which the Bible portrays the doom of the wicked! Hell in the future is but the continuance of some such life in the soul as this; only that the longer sin is cherished as the chosen part of the moral nature, the

offending sufferer entails upon himself an ever-increasing amount of wretchedness, and prosecutes with fearfully augmenting speed and success the work of his undoing. Sin, now and ever, is its own awful punishment; and there in the soul that sinneth, and so long as it sinneth, are the undying worm and the unquenchable fire. Hell is absence from God. It is the hiding of his countenance. There is no heaven where his smile is not, but only orphanage and anguish. Sin where or when we may, we so far withdraw ourselves from his blessed companionship, and avert from us his benignant look, and betake ourselves into the outer darkness, where it is not too much to say there are weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth.

As heaven and hell are not localized spheres in the infinite universe of space, but are only certain spiritual conditions or states which we experience here and hereafter, there is no particular place in that boundless expanse to which we must needs go, and in which we must needs be confined. Just where we die in the body and "shuffle off this mortal coil," we awake to the new life of the spirit and continue the ceaseless existence of our conscious being. We, each one, indeed, like Judas, go to our own place, the place for which we are fitted, the place for which we have prepared ourselves in all our earthly history. But that place is a state or condition. We take with us into the eternal world what we carry with us out of this; the same inward affections, tastes, propensities, sympathies, and will. Death has no power to change the character of our spiritual nature. It is the body alone that suffers change. The immortal soul lives on. It enters the life that is to come just as it leaves the life that now is. Whether its immediate portion will be hell or heaven there, depends upon whether its choice was hell or heaven here. There it is free, doubtless, to roam at its will. But it never can fly from itself, and wherever it wanders it will ever seek and will find, through a law as irresistible as that of gravitation, the companionships and associations that are most congenial to it. It may be that even now we are environed, beset, and influenced by unseen spirits that are good or bad, according as we are ourselves holy or ungodly in heart

and life; and as we awake in the great invisible realms, we may possibly find that we are in the very midst of beings and surroundings which have been naturally attracted to us by our virtues or vices, by our love of God, or love of the world, the flesh, and the devil. So far as modern Spiritualism has emphasized this and kindred doctrines; so far as it has taught that we live, and move, and have our being in a spiritual universe even more than in the material, and that we are shut in and acted upon, and greatly affected by a thousand intelligent agencies and subtle influences of the other world —it is entitled, I think, to respectful consideration, not to say, a most serious and solemn heed. Not that these views are peculiar to Spiritualism or new to the minds of men, but only that recently they have been more distinctly and forcibly brought before us and urged upon our attention.

But some will say: "As the dead thus awake to the immortal life, in what body do they come?" We believe in no resurrection of these visible, material forms of flesh and blood, nor do we think that the passages in the Scripture which refer to this subject necessitate what seems to us such a gross, unspiritual interpretation. They speak, indeed, of the resurrection of the dead, the coming forth of the departed from their graves. But this language is natural to us all, whether we believe in the resurrection of the material body or not, It is poetic, striking, inevitable. It simply means the re-appearance in the spiritual world, or at the judgment, of those who have passed from the mortal life—not so much their earthly forms, but the vanished ones themselves—their undying personalities, their imperishable souls.

In what body do the come? Not the body of flesh and blood that dissolves, decays. It enters into new forms of vegetable and animal life, and in the process of time its particles become distributed as it were throughout the earth. It is consumed, like Wickliffe's bones, by fire, its ashes given to the stream which bears them on to the sea—and whence shall it come forth in the resurrection? It is divided and scattered, like many a soldier's, over successive battle-fields, where it has been cleft by the sabre, or torn by shot and shell—and how shall it

rise again to life in all its symmetry and entireness? The arguments or answers by which these fatal objections to the doctrine in question are met, and which claim that as God is infinite in power, he can and will, by a wonderful miracle at the last great day, bring together from however widely separated points, the rent or disintegrated parts of the bodies of men, and make them whole again, and that the earth, and sea, and air will be all alive with disjointed portions of human forms flying in every direction to seek their once companion dust, or that some fragment or particle of the lifeless frame shall retain the vital principle until the august time, and that divine power shall rebuild it into an image, which, if it do not contain the identical constituent elements of its predecessor, shall yet be composed of exactly equivalent chemical ingredients—these arguments, I say, are ludicrously wild and fanciful, and have no sufficient foundation in Scripture as they have none in common sense.

Rather is it reasonable to suppose that as there is a natural body and also a spiritual body, so the latter, or its immortal germ, is even now tabernacling in the former, and that at death it is disengaged from its companion clay, and stands forth at once unharmed by fire or sword, by accident or disease, its texture and organization finer and more delicate than we can now conceive—itself perfect and beautiful for ever. And this is the resurrection. We shall not need to come back ages hence from a local heaven or hell to enter again and re-inhabit the fleshly, perished tenements in which we once sinned and suffered in order to realize the consummation of our eternal destiny. We shall have risen already. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."

Nor, in the "house from heaven," with which the soul is thus "clothed upon," does it lose for a moment its sure identity. Character gives to these earthly lineaments its own appropriate moral expression. More fully yet shall it shine through and reveal itself in the spiritual countenance. Something of form and feature which belongs to the material body, may thus still lend itself to that which is invisible and imperishable. "All the angels," says Swedenborg, "are forms of their own affections." And then all those peculiar affinities and

influences that distinguish any one whom we know or love, the glance of the eye, the smile of the face, the tone of the voice, the play of the mind and manner, the silent power that steals forth from him, and the certain atmosphere that surrounds him—by all of which we are enabled so quickly to recognize him as our own—shall not something of it yet remain and remain for ever to make him still the same?—

"Lovelier in heaven's sweet climate, yet the same."

The doctrine of the recognition of friends in heaven is one which it seems almost strange that any should ever have been led to disbelieve. Why may we not suppose that our guardian angels are the dear ones who have passed into the light before us, and that when for us also the day shall break and the shadows flee away, theirs shall be the sweet familiar faces that shall first dawn upon us from the dissolving gloom, and theirs the arms that shall extend to us the glad and blissful welcome? Let us never doubt that, however they may not visibly come to us, yet we shall surely go to them.

And as death is the hour of resurrection, so is it the appropriate signal for the judgment. The Scriptural language which has been supposed to refer to a general assemblage of the race at some future awful day for final judgment, long ago had its fulfilment in the event of the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the momentous circumstances that immediately preceded or followed that important crisis in Jewish history. Or if, indeed, it pointed to anything that was more distant in its application, it looked for its ultimate accomplishment to those transcendent moments when the souls of men were to hasten from the earthly state into the more immediate presence of God. It is then, if ever, that we pass the solemn review, and are sentenced, each one to his proper place. It needs not the endless array of the congregated universe of intelligences, nor yet the audible voice of the Son of Man. It is the word which he hath already declared; it is the unrolled map of the terrestrial life; it is the clearer vision of God whom we have loved or offended; it is the full blaze of those stupendous revelations that await us as we exchange the mortal for immortality; it is these, and such as these that shall judge us. It is here that we shall unerringly

read our righteous awards, and it is in this tremendous presence that we shall rise or sink according as we have done good or evil.

(*To be continued.*)

THE TWO SUNSETS.

No bird-song floated down the hill,
The tangled bank below was still;
No rustle from the birchen stem,
No ripple from the water's hem.
The dusk of twilight round us grew,
We felt the falling of the dew;
For, from us, ere the day was done,
The wooded hills shut out the sun.

But, on the river's farther side,
We saw the hill-tops glorified;
A tender glow, exceeding fair,
A dream of day, without its glare.
With us the damp, the chill, the gloom;
With them the sunset's rosy bloom;
While dark, through willowy vistas seen,
The river rolled in shade between.

From out the darkness where we trod,
We gazed upon those hills of God,
Whose light seemed not of moon or sun:
We spake not, but our thought was one.
We paused, as if from that bright shore
Beckoned our dear ones gone before;
And stilled our beating hearts to hear
The voices lost to mortal ear!

Sudden our pathway turned from night;
The hills swung open to the light;
Through their green gates the sunshine showed;
A long, slant splendour downward flowed.
Down glade, and glen, and bank it rolled;
It bridged the shaded stream with gold,
And, borne on piers of mist, allied
The shadowy with the sunlit side!

"So," prayed we, "when our feet draw near
The river, dark with mortal fear,
And the night cometh, chill with dew,
O Father! let Thy light break through!
So let the hills of doubt divide,
So bridge with faith the sunless tide?
So let the eyes that fall on earth
On Thy eternal hills look forth;
And, in Thy beckoning angels, know
The dear ones whom we loved below!"

J. G. WHITTIER.

THE WIDOW'S SON AT NAIN.

A SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSON.—No. 7.

NAIN was a small town of Galilee, a few miles from Nazareth, and very near Mount Tabor, the supposed place of the transfiguration, but which, it is quite certain, did not take place there. There is a small and very poor village still called Nain, standing on the same spot as the ancient city stood, but all vestige of the Nain that existed in the times of our Saviour is gone. Nain is called by the Evangelist Luke a city, but the Jews were accustomed to term every place of any size a city. It must, however, have been a walled town, as we read of the gate through which the young man was carried out to be buried. The gates of Eastern towns are closed and carefully guarded every night, being open by day for public accommodation. At the gates persons were accustomed to assemble for the transaction of business and for conversation, much like the market places, such as at Athens, where Paul disputed with the philosophers daily. Nain was situated in a beautiful country on the borders of the fruitful plain of Esdraelon, in the high mountains to the north. It is more than probable that Jesus had before and frequently visited this town, and was known to some of the inhabitants. At the same time, Nain lying out of the usual road from Galilee to

Jerusalem, it has been well remarked that he must, on the occasion related by St. Luke, have gone purposely thither—gone out of his ordinary way—for the compassionate work of restoring the dead man to life. He knew beforehand, because he had the Spirit beyond measure, that on such a day and hour the corpse of the poor young man, followed by his weeping, twice-desolate mother, would be carried from the place of his birth to the lonely silent tomb, and he was touched with compassion, for he was full of compassion for all who were in distress, and he continually went about doing good. Jesus goes to Nain to work a great miracle—that of calling "the sleeping dead to rise," to dry the mourner's tears, and thus to turn sorrow into joy.

And never was a story more plainly told, in fewer words, and yet in a manner so interesting and delightful. The whole scene is brought in the liveliest manner before our eyes. Jesus had been healing the faithful servant of the devout centurion by a word speaking, and without having seen the sick man at all; and, full of tenderness and mercy, he goes the next day to Nain—be it remembered many miles from Capernaum, and under the burning sun of Palestine—for the sole purpose of restoring this young man to his widowed mother. Her husband being dead, he was the only support of the family; in losing him, she was deprived of her sole remaining prop, whilst she could have had no idea that relief was nigh. She may have heard of Jesus, but it is most likely she did not know him, and certainly she had no expectation that he would come so far and so much out of the way to bring her son, living and well, back to her. The mournful procession passed through the city gate, "much people of the city" were there. A large crowd, attracted by kindly feeling, pressed round the mourners, and deeply sympathized in their grief, for the melancholy circumstances aroused their pity, and they did what they could to comfort the bereaved mother. We may observe here that Jewish funerals were usually large, persons thinking it meritorious to follow the corpse, and to assist in bearing it to the grave. Again, coffins were not in use with the Jews, the body was placed on a bier, swathed in many yards of linen, and with the face exposed, thus

Lazarus came out of the tomb, bound hand and foot with the grave clothes; and our Lord himself was buried in the same way, his body wrapped in fine linen with sweet spices. The dead were commonly buried the day they expired, as were Ananias and Sapphira. The grave-yards were outside the city walls, and at some distance, the mourners always walked.

These explanations are necessary to illustrate the little history before us. We see how it was that much people of the city were with the widowed mother, and that the young man who had died could at once sit up on the bier when the voice of Jesus called him to rise, whilst we can never enough admire and reverence the power exercised by our Lord, nor his benevolence in thus displaying it. He comes, unhoped-for, unexpected, to the house of sorrow, and with a word he gives beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning. Then the kindness of his manner, making the favour twice blessed—"And when the Lord saw her he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not." These were not words of course, not the mere expression of sympathy, though such words, such an expression, would have been something; but the words were accompanied by a deed the most beneficent, the most acceptable that could have been offered. Nor, again, was the deed performed coldly, ungraciously, with hard or tart language, but in a manner the most winning, with the utmost tenderness of feeling towards her who was now a widow indeed. Jesus, our great Master, our pattern, as well as our Redeemer, was ever a merciful High Priest to be touched with a sense of our infirmities. He spoke most gently to the unhappy, and with a heart full of love; he wept and was troubled in spirit at the grave of Lazarus; he lamented over the city whose people were about to crucify him, and he loved and he pitied the rich young man, very amiable, yet who could not leave the world to follow him. So the Lord comes now graciously to the sorrowing mother. "Weep not," are his words; and then with all the dignity of the Son of God he approaches the bier, whilst the bearers, awed by his presence and manner, submissively trembling, stand still, and he utters, with a voice of authority, the command, "Young man, I say unto thee, arise,"—a

command not to be resisted,—for, to the intense astonishment, and even for the time, the terror of the by-standers, "he that was dead sat up and began to speak." We must observe, of all the Saviour's miracles, that no sooner was the word spoken by him than the thing was done. His word was, truly, with power, nothing could resist it, the effect was instantaneous. This young man not only sat up on the bier in his grave-clothes, but he spake that he might show the wonderful work was complete, to assure those that stood by of its reality, to comfort and cheer his mother, and doubtless to give glory to God for the great deliverance thus vouchsafed. So the widow's heart, bowed down by more than common grief, was now made to leap and sing for joy, whilst she must have felt how true was the Scripture which saith, "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning;" and so must the multitude, also, have glorified God, because he had visited his people.

And we, dear young friends, must give glory to God for the gift of his beloved Son our Saviour, honoured and beloved. What the poor widow felt on the loss of her only child, her chief earthly stay, many others have felt—all may be called on to feel. She received her son to life again. We shall never thus receive back our friends. When they die we know that they quit this world for ever; but the same voice which called the young man to rise will also call us from our tombs—call us at the last great day to receive for the deeds done in the body. Let us be ready for the summons. Then parents will meet children, brothers will meet brothers, friends meet friends, and all who have done good here will be blessed together in that state which eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, and the glories of which no heart can conceive now.

"Lord to our eyes this scene display
Frequent through each revolving day,
That, lost in this each meaner care,
We may to meet our judge prepare."

B.

A DEFINITE THEOLOGY.

BY REV. DR. BELLOWS.

In pleading the worth and the necessity of theological distinctness, of uprightness of heart and clearness of knowledge in the utterance of theological opinions, it will be at once inquired whether the old polemics are to be revived, and the starved souls of men to be fed on the husks of controversial divinity; whether or not it seems desirable to bring men, women, and children together, in need of humility, chastening, consolation, moral elevation, and spiritual quickening, to listen to discussions on the Trinity and the Atonement, Election and Predestination, or whether infants or adults are the proper subject for baptism. This is a question not for us, but for those who believe these doctrines; and a very serious question it is for them. If these are really the doctrines of Christianity, and if the Gospel is to be taught at all, then these *are* the proper subjects of Christian preaching; and if they are not profitable, Christianity is not profitable. For the doctrines of any system, art, science, or policy—that is, the fundamental truths on which it rests—are, and ever must be, the most essential and the most profitable things to think about and to talk about, if the system be a true and important system. The statesman cannot think, the patriot cannot speak, of the doctrines of government too often or too urgently. The artist cannot study or discuss too seriously the doctrines of colour, form, and perspective, which underlie his noble vocation. The astronomer cannot investigate, display, and popularize the doctrines of his science too carefully, if he would bring it forward. And is it only Christianity whose doctrines are to be regarded as non-essential, barren, and intrusive? Is it only religion about which men need to know nothing fundamentally, clearly, systematically? Or has science, art, government, commerce, society, custom—everything, in short—its original principles, its essential doctrines, while Christianity has none worth speaking of? If doctrinal preaching has degenerated into mere controversial preaching; if the popular creeds are no longer welcomed or deemed instructive in the popular churches, it is indeed

high time to inquire whether they really do fitly represent and embody the fundamental principles of Christianity; in short, whether they *are* the doctrines of the Gospel. That they are not so, and that the heart of the *world* feels this before its intellect is prepared to acknowledge and establish the fact, I am fully convinced. But I hold the inference which is drawn from the unpopularity and non-essential character of the church dogmas,—that *no* dogmas of Christianity are true or important, or that Christianity has *no* doctrines,—a very illogical and mischievous inference. Christianity need not be revealed *as* a system, in order to be a system; it need not have its doctrine about God, or about Christ, or about man, or about morals, or about piety, specially stated on the pages of the New Testament as doctrine, in order to make it possible, and binding on men, to deduce from its general drift, and a studious examination and comparison of its scattered teaching, what its fundamental and essential principles are.

We have created from the observation and study of the universe a system of Natural Theology; we have proved the being of God, his attributes and character, from the comparison of nature and man; and nobody doubts the importance of a systematic acquaintance with Natural Theology, or the reality of the thing itself, because it is not printed in starry letters on the sky, or chaptered or versed in the flowers of the field. Why, then, should we imagine that the Christian Theology, the doctrines of the New Testament, are not important, or not intended to be fathomed and known and used as the great instruments of faith, because professedly they do not exist in the pages of the Bible, in the form in which they stand in the Westminster Catechism? If the Westminster, or any other Catechism, were a successful compilation, abstract, or codification of the New Testament, it would be invaluable, and worth all the study and belief we could bring to it.

It is only because that doctrinal statement is unsatisfactory, is a prejudiced, partial, and even false account of the Gospel system, that we repudiate it, and that the Christian world is nearly ready to do so. But that another statement must be made, earnestly taught and patiently learned—in short, that an intellectual account of the contents, the fundamentals, the drift and method of

Christianity, must be prepared and commended to men, if we hope to produce in them fruits of faith, or to give them the supports and consolations of belief and knowledge, I hold to be very certain.

I am not saying now *what* the doctrines of the Gospel are. I simply insist that it has doctrines. Do you assert, on the contrary, that it is a spirit—that it commends a certain temper and frame of mind? Very well. Then let us have a doctrine of this spirit. What is this spirit? how is it invited? from whence does it come? how is it to be secured? how known and tested? how communicated? Let us know definitely all that can be discovered and said of the laws of the spirit, and call that the doctrinal system of the Gospel. But I confess that I consider this very language, that Christianity is a spirit, merely an indication and proof of the vague and indefinite way of thinking prevailing among those who have broken from the popular creeds. Christianity is, or pretends to be, a revealed religion. It has a history, true or fictitious, real or mythical. That its history has been as real as any history for seventeen hundred years, or thereabouts, is admitted everywhere; that its early history, that is for the first hundred years, is obscure and inferential in part, is not denied here. But that the solidest and most careful minds the world has produced since have been compelled to concede, and been rejoiced to acknowledge, the credibility of its chief records and its own account of itself, is equally undeniable. Are, then, the study and acceptance of the four Gospels—first to be satisfied of their claims to belief, and next to see what a magnificent and sublime fact they assert, *i.e.* that God has revealed himself in a revelation supplementary to nature and soul, to man's understanding and affections—are these definite things which are to be done and known in regard to the Gospel, vague, misty generalities, or are they sober positive facts? I can understand and respect an honest man's denial, after examination, of the fact of a revelation by Christ; but I cannot understand or respect, or have any feelings but those of astonishment and indignation, for any man's indifference to the fact, or to the solemn pretensions to the fact, made in so august a manner by the New Testament. Nor can I feel anything but scorn for the intellectual

weakness that does not perceive that the simple, signal fact that God has spoken by his Son, independently of what he has said, is itself a stupendous fact, capable of revolutionizing the world.

I call that fact the first and fundamental doctrine of Christianity—namely, that God has broken the silence of nature and the ages, and spoken in a miracle to men by his Son. I do not wonder that sober and earnest infidels have directed their keenest scrutiny to this claim, and heaped up their most formidable arguments against it. They have rightly felt that, if Christianity is to be refuted, this is the first fact to refute; if its influence is to be abated, this is the great influence to abate. And are Christians to allow this fundamental to become a rolling stone, or a stone of stumbling; to permit, without the greatest and most earnest argumentation, the very origin of Christianity, confessedly obscure, to be pronounced also mythical and incredible? Or is it to be waived gracefully as a question of secondary importance? Or is it even to be frankly conceded that the worth and importance of our religion are really not affected by its origin, or want of origin? I believe I appreciate the worth of those spiritual affections which cling to the moral elements of Christianity, even after its historical truth is denied. But I cannot understand the indifference which is felt by many to the settlement of a question which seems to me, in logical consequences, the most momentous in all history. The blind impetuosity which has allowed the liberal body in this country to declare this point one of secondary importance, has come near defeating its whole mission; and unless we learn in time that the very essence of Christianity as a system lies in the truth of its special character as a divine revelation, and that this fact alone is more pertinent than all the doctrines of Orthodoxy put together, to the actual wants of humanity, God will take away our sceptre over the future, and give it to another and later-born body of reformers, who shall not have been seduced from the fundamental fact of revelation by the sophistries of a shallow materialistic science, the vanities of modern transcendental philosophy, or the crotchets of a self-conceited textual criticism.

REVIEWS.

THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE DOCTRINE OF CONTINUITY: *A Sermon.* By P. W. CLAYDEN.

THE exercise of rational and reverential discrimination, which characterised the life and writings of our Unitarian forefathers, seems now on the point of being repudiated as "narrow and frigid rationalism" by some of the investigators of physical science, as it has long been by many of the professed advocates of freedom of thought in connection with religion.

Darwin's hypothesis of the Origin of Species has (it would appear from the Address of the President of the British Scientific Association, at its recent meeting at Nottingham, recorded in *The Athenæum* of August 25) received much additional confirmation from the careful inquiry and research of many eminent scientific investigators since its first publication; and hence, in regard to species, the principle of continuity appears to be fully established in opposition to that of new and separate original creation. Numerous and well-ascertained facts have been adduced, which clearly prove (in the judgment of these scientific investigators) that varieties of species are simply referable to the action on individuals of the genus to which they belong, of physical influences, the continuous agency of which may be traced back to the very commencement of the earth on which we live. But what evidence has yet been adduced to prove that these continuous and unchanging influences are of themselves sufficient to account for the far wider varieties of distinct orders and genera? Has it yet been discovered that vitality is nothing more than a development, under these physical influences, of that which was originally inert and dead?—that *conscious* vitality, in like manner, is nothing more than a similar development of mere vitality?—that rational and spiritual life is nothing more than a similar development of mere animal life?—so that God did not originally create, as distinct orders of being, vegetables, or animals, or man, but simply provided for their successive development, under the con-

tinuous energy which He every moment supplies. Where is the evidence of such continuity as this? And until such evidence can be presented, how irrational and unscientific is the assumption of it!

Such is the continuity on which Mr. Clayden dilates in this sermon. He writes—

"All the various forms of life have thus put on their wonderful diversity, by slow and constant change—though all are one in their origin, and, like diverging lines, starting from one point to widen for ever. . . . . The theory of interferences, in its religious aspect is, that the world is something *on* which God works and which He has to superintend. The theory of "continuity" is, that the world is a wonderful organism, *in* which God works as an interior and directing spirit—an animating life. According to the one theory, He is to be looked for only in that which is unusual and occasional—in the storm, the earthquake, and the fire; according to the other, He is to be looked for in that which is usual and common—that which comes upon us with no surprise, but speaks with still, small voice, though it speaks perpetually of His presence and power." (Page 6.)

What lamentable confusion of thought is here! Has the writer of this sermon ever read Priestley's Institutes of Natural Religion, or Paley's Natural Theology? If he have, he has read them without understanding them, for the arguments in both of them are in direct contradiction of these assertions; yet neither Priestley nor Paley would have been prepared to admit, without evidence, that man was not originally a distinct creation but the result of a gradual development.

Even should this doctrine of mere continuity be ultimately established in connection with the material world, we have distinct evidence *against* it in connection with the moral and spiritual world. Unless we are resolved to reject entirely all historical testimony, and so to cut ourselves off from that source of knowledge and improvement which our Creator has specially ordained for our intellectual, and moral, and spiritual progress, it is certain that God *does* interfere for the manifestation of Himself and His will,—*does* superintend His moral and spiritual offspring and make that superintendence distinctly visible to them. If this be not true, then Christianity is nothing better than an idle superstition, and we Christians are deluded and enslaved by it. But grant, only as an hypothesis for argument's sake, that Chris-

tianity *is* true, and that, rather more than eighteen centuries ago, God sent His beloved Son, Jesus Christ, into the world, the records of whose ministry, and death, and resurrection, are preserved to us in the Gospels and confirmed by the Acts and Epistles, which constitute our New Testament—how can we know whether these records are veritable or not otherwise than by *historical testimony?* Accordingly, until recently, it has been thought essential that every youthful member of a Christian congregation should be, to some extent, instructed in this historical testimony, and that, consequently, the minister of the congregation should be prepared to communicate such instruction, and should diligently devote himself to it. As an essential aid in the accomplishment of this, his special work, he used to be referred (in my college days) to the works of those most enlightened, discriminating, conscientious, and Christian men who had devoted their studious thought to the investigation and arrangement of these historical testimonies, and who exhibited considerable portions of them in their original language as well as in translation, together with the rational inferences which they themselves deduced from the perusal and investigation of them. Lardner and Priestley were deservedly eminent among writers of this class, and accordingly were always quoted, in my early days, as reliable authorities in connection with these testimonies. Several years ago a most irrational and presumptuous tendency began to manifest itself, to substitute *intuition* for *testimony*, against which, soon after its commencement, my beloved and venerated colleague, the late Rev. John Kentish, entered his most direct, and rational, and earnest protest, as follows, in his Review of Dr. Greenleaf's "Veracity of the Evangelists":—

"Our grateful acknowledgments are respectfully tendered to Professor Greenleaf for these his labours. We the more value them because they regard *matters of fact*, which they treat of naturally and appositely, just as such topics ought to be handled. Let not the evidence of *intuition* be any longer substituted for that of *testimony;* nor let us continue to lose sight of the example of the first of all philosophers, who, in his searches after Truth, attributed nothing to himself beyond 'industry and patient thought'" —*Christian Reformer*, 1848, p. 457.

This protest had as little effect during Mr. Kentish's

life as had the protest of our Divine Teacher and Lord during *his* life. And, soon after Mr. Kentish's death, there appeared in *The London Inquirer*, some twelve or thirteen years ago, an editorial article, contemptuously disparaging the labours of Lardner and Priestley and other illustrious men, and suggesting that no further attention need be paid to them. Accordingly, many of our pulpits are now occupied by men who never have attained conviction of the truth of Christianity from that historical testimony on which it must of necessity be founded; and one of them, who took upon himself to reply to the inquiry, "What do we, as Unitarian Christians, believe?" has now publicly avowed that he blends the natural and the supernatural, and regards the distinction between them as merely artificial, which faith, and love, and knowledge, will some time break down—(John Page Hopps, *Inquirer*, July 28, 1866, p. 470.) If that distinction ever *is* broken down, the Christianity of the New Testament will be broken down together with it; and to the realization of this most lamentable catastrophe, under the influence of these self-sufficient and uninstructed men, very many uninstructed members of our denomination are now rapidly hastening.

I grieve to discern such confirmation of the clearly and honourably avowed apprehensions of the excellent Dr. Cromwell in his article, "Whither are we tending?" But being resolved, with him, to approve myself a *faithful* minister of Christ, I cannot, and will not shut my eyes against it, nor permit any whom I can influence to do so.

SAMUEL BACHE,

Senior Pastor of the Church of the Messiah, Birmingham.

EDGBASTON, *Sept.* 8, 1866.

UNITARIANISM: WHAT CLAIMS HAS IT TO RESPECT AND FAVOUR. By JOSEPH BARKER.

SUCH is the title of a lecture in which Mr. Joseph Barker ruthlessly assails Unitarianism and Unitarians. The history of this remarkable man may be known to many of our readers, and has already been briefly noticed in our pages. He was brought up in the Methodist deno-

mination, and was for some years a minister in the New Connexion. Possessed of a vigorous mind, a most retentive memory, and great fluency and power of speech, he soon became a popular preacher; but almost as soon, his views became somewhat heretical, and, after considerable disputing with the authorities in the Methodist Church, he withdrew, or was expelled, and afterwards, as an advocate for what he termed "Evangelical Reform," he attracted much attention and won many followers. In the North of England, especially, he was instrumental in forming several congregations, whose members accepted the Bible as their only creed, and Christ Jesus as their only Master. The result of Mr. Barker's inquiries into Scriptural truth was—that he rejected the Trinity, the doctrine of Two Natures in Christ, a Vicarious Atonement, and Original Sin. He was never identified with the Unitarians, so far as we can remember, but, from the views which he preached, it may be easily understood that the sympathies of the denomination were strongly with him; he was admitted into their pulpits, and admired not more for his abilities as a lecturer than for his manly and independent character. He laboured diligently, by means of tracts, to disseminate his liberal opinions, and we have before us a sheaf of these, many of them remarkable for the force and clearness with which they expose prevailing errors in doctrine, and exhibit the beautiful simplicity of Christian Truth. To aid Mr. Barker in his indefatigable efforts to circulate useful tracts and books, his Unitarian friends subscribed liberally, and presented him with a printing press. Soon, however, he abandoned Christianity and embraced Deistical views, to the great disappointment and sorrow of his Unitarian friends and other liberal Christians. For some time, we cannot say how long, he laboured to spread his newly-adopted opinions; and then came another change—he abandoned his belief in a God, and avowed himself an Atheist. With his history at this period we are not acquainted. When we next heard of him, he was publishing jointly, we think, with George Holyoake, the Secularist, a Review in which his wretched and demoralizing principles were distinctly, and, we may presume, ably advocated. Suddenly, about three years

ago, he returned to Christianity, and soon connected himself again with the Methodist Body. In all these changes we have no reason to impute unworthy motives to Mr. Barker; but, with much acknowledged ability, it is evident from his history that he is an eccentric man, "unstable as water;" and we cannot judge from the opinions he holds to-day what he may think to-morrow; in a little time he may go on to Popery, or swing back to Atheism.

In every change through which Mr. Barker has passed he has been distinguished by his powers of abuse, and has dealt out his Billingsgate eloquence against those from whom for the time he differed. Thus at a period when his mind was as vigorous and his judgment as clear as it can be now, for he was not then a young man, he thus describes Orthodoxy and its supporters:—

"I do not believe in Orthodox Theology. I believe it to be unscriptural and false,—I believe it to be absurd and abominable,—I believe it to be immoral and blasphemous,—I believe it to be a bundle of delusions, a mass of frauds, a heap of corruption." *

"With what is the Trinity connected in the Orthodox sects of Britain and North America? With intolerance, divisions, and persecutions, . . . with covetousness, oppression, and drunkenness,—with lying and slandering,—with forging lies, and hypocrisy,—with robbery and murder, . . . with wholesale and horrible profligacy, and with all abominations." †

At the same time he thus spoke of Unitarianism:—

"I have always heard them spoken of as men who were either enemies to Christ or ignorant of Christ's religion, or as individuals who set at nought divine authority, and as so bad, that one did not know what manner of dreadful characters they were. I soon found that these statements, made by hired and interested individuals, were false,—that Unitarians did not reject the Scriptures,—that they respected them,—that the liberty they sought was simply the liberty of judging for themselves as to their meaning, and of applying the Scriptures to all the purposes of the Christian life for themselves. I therefore changed my views of Unitarians and of Unitarianism itself; and though I cannot be a Unitarian, as Unitarianism is presented to my mind at present, yet still I must declare that Unitarians are, so far as I have known them, the best body of Christians I have met with; that they are remarkable for intelligence, for love of truth, for virtue, for philanthropy,—for everything like God and Jesus Christ; and that they will not only

* Barker and Cooke's Discussion, p. 602. † *Ib.*, p 299.

bear comparison with professing Christians of other denominations, so far as I am acquainted with them, but that they are, in fact, far superior to them generally in these respects. This testimony I am glad to have an opportunity of giving on behalf of this most abused—this most unjustly and wickedly slandered and persecuted people of God." *

These extracts exhibit not only Mr. Barker's views of Orthodoxy and Unitarianism, but also the strong terms which he employs so freely to express his feelings, whether of admiration or dislike. In the pamphlet before us Orthodoxy is extolled, and Unitarianism and Unitarians are denounced with all the abusive epithets he can employ. He states that the tendencies of Unitarianism are degrading and vicious, and represents Unitarians as immoral, alleging that "in some cases the congregations have sunk down into drunken cliques or clubs," and says that, in one place the Unitarians were so drunken and depraved that they attempted to drive their minister away for speaking on the necessity of temperance and virtue. He says that "Unitarians are booked through to perdition, and the only way in which they can save themselves is by changing trains." He says they are "false prophets," "bad trees," "wolves in sheeps' clothing," "thieves and robbers," "scoffers," "wells without water," "clouds without rain;" and he thus concludes a long tirade, from which we have made these "elegant extracts:"—

"Some have charged Mr. Wesley with uncharitableness, because in one of his hymns he has a strong prayer against the Unitarian heresy. We endorse the prayer, and in the very spirit of Christ, both towards the deceivers and towards those still in danger of being deceived, we pray—

'The Unitarian fiend expel,
And chase his doctrine back to hell.'"

The coarse abuse in which this Lecture abounds must be condemned even by those who agree with Mr. Barker's present theological views, while the arguments he introduces might easily be neutralized by reasonings more powerful and conclusive, with which, in former years, he opposed the opinions which he now professes. But, nevertheless, we confess that we have read the pamphlet

* Barker and Cooke's Discussion, p. 289.

with pain and humiliation, for the writer, fairly enough, supports his allegation that Unitarianism is Unbelief under another name, by referring to numerous articles in *The Unitarian Herald*, and by quoting various passages from an outrageously infidel article by one of the editors of that journal, which appeared in the number for August 11, 1865, and which, in the following month, we criticised in *The Christian Unitarian*. Till there is some boundary line drawn to separate Christians from unbelievers—some recognition of the Divine in Christianity as the foundation of our Church—we must still be exposed to such charges as Mr. Barker and others bring against us; and while they can adduce in their support such statements as *The Herald* and other publications supply, remonstrance and denial on the part of those who have no sympathy with scepticism and unbelief will go for nothing.

CHRISTIANS AND DEISTS.

[The following article, forwarded to us by a correspondent, is from the pen of the Rev. James Martineau, and forms the preface to the second edition of his Rationale of Religious Inquiry;* and it so well expresses and advocates views which *The Christian Unitarian* has distinctly and frequently contended for, and which *The Inquirer* and *Unitarian Herald* have as distinctly and as frequently opposed, that we have much satisfaction in placing it before our readers. How far Mr. Martineau has since modified his opinions we cannot accurately ascertain, but we know that some who look up to him and his learned colleague in Manchester New College as their leaders, admit of no essential distinction between Christianity and Deism, and stigmatize as bigots and intolerants those who hold the very views which are here so fairly and clearly expressed.—Ed. Ch. Un.]

One sentiment which occurs in this volume, the objections of more than one friendly and able critic have induced me to reconsider. I allude to the statement at the end of the fourth lecture, that in no intelligible sense can any one, who denies the supernatural origin of the religion of Christ, be termed a Christian. The miracles, I am well aware, are extensively doubted and disbelieved

* "The Rationale of Religious Enquiry," Six Lectures by James Martineau. London: Whitaker & Co., 1836.

by those who yet reverence and adopt the moral and devotional system of the author of Christianity: and the attachment of such men to the name *Christian* is perfectly natural. The miracles which they reject are commonly represented as necessary only to recommend the truths which they retain: and if they find themselves able to dispense with the recommendation, and to arrive at the truths in question by a process of their own, they conceive themselves to be essentially Christians, because in their minds the ends which Christianity proposed are realized.

In questioning the propriety of applying the term *Christian* to the large class who incline to this mode of thinking, nothing could be further from my intention than to make any *harsh* declaration, or any statement *against* them. As I assume no merit, and claim no sanctity to myself for that act of judgment which leads me to believe in the miraculous, so do I ascribe no demerit to them for that act of judgment which leads them to reject it. I do not even affect to regard the distinction between us as very serious: it is by no means so serious as that by which I feel myself separated from the great majority of Christians,—if at least their authorized formularies express their real faith. The great antagonist principles of religion, between which it is the duty of good men to take their choice, are ORTHODOXY and RATIONALISM: of which the one makes belief a duty of the will, and judges men by their creed; the other makes it an involuntary act of the understanding, and judges them by their character. Between these two principles no reconcilation can possibly be effected: and all who attempt to reconcile them (among whom are included those Unitarians who are reserved towards Deism, and conciliatory to Orthodoxy) are responsible for the maintenance of a mischievous confusion of ideas. And while a just estimate of the tendencies of the two systems requires the perfect separation of authoritative from rational religion, it equally requires the practical union of all upright adherents to the latter, without reference to their opinions respecting the supernatural origin of Christianity. To effect this union, existing sectarian distinctions must, in some important instances, be modified or dissolved; and good men from many churches, or from no church, be allowed to organize themselves by their natural sympathies into one earnest community, determined to reconcile deep moral and religious sentiment with unlimited intellectual freedom.

In withholding, then, the title *Christian* from anti-supernaturalists, I did not design to deprive them of a name of praise, but simply of a designation of belief. The objection was not moral, but logical: and I conceive, that if they had distinctly explained in what sense they assumed the appellation, if they had avowedly used it merely to express their reverence for the character and spirit of Christ;—to denote the school of sentiment to which their own views of human duty and human life were most assimilated, no one could justly have complained. But common usage has irrevocably associated with the term the idea of belief in the divine (by which, in popular language, is always meant the *supernatural*) origin of Christianity. And the attempt to cancel this association, to blot out from the name all notion of any sort of belief, and confine it to the designation of a certain class of moral feelings, is certain both

to mislead and to fail. If no amount of historical disbelief is to forfeit the name, any eccentric theorist who should maintain that no such person as Jesus Christ ever existed, and that the Gospels are a prose fiction not five centuries old, would still be a Christian, provided he discovered in the feigned prophet of Nazareth qualities which he loved. If all are to be termed disciples, who show in the temper of their minds that they are under the guidance of a moral spirit similar to that of Christ, Socrates was no less a Christian than Melancthon, and Rammohun Roy in his early veneration for the Vedas, no less than Wesley in his diffusion of the gospel. If none are to be called Christians, except those who appreciate and manifest the moral spirit of Christ, the name must be denied by liberal-minded disciples to all bigots and exclusive pietists. And so long as it remains a question, what the moral spirit of the Gospel really is, the wretched system of mutual crimination, and of internal dispute respecting the genuineness of discipleship, will be hopelessly prolonged.

There are but two senses in which the word *Christian* can be employed: to denote the admission either of *the interior sentiments* of Christianity, or of *the divinity of its external origin*. Those who venerate the interior sentiments of Christianity constitute no real class: the unity which belongs to them is not mental, but purely verbal; for as the Christian records furnish to ten different interpreters ten different orders of sentiment, the subjects of veneration are not the same. On the other hand, those who hold the external origin of Christianity to be supernatural, truly have, in this belief, an idea in common; and if the word Christian is employed to denote the presence of this idea, its signification becomes definite, its application distinct, and its extension so liberal, as to embrace all interpretations of the contents and moral spirit of the gospel. Used thus, it ceases to be a term of approbation, and retains only a part of its present popular meaning. This however is by no means to be regretted. That the same word should be the name, both of a particular belief, and of certain moral qualities, is exceedingly injurious, as it necessarily associates in the minds of men an intellectual opinion and a moral condition, and keeps alive the error, that operations of the understanding are proper objects of approval and censure. To avoid this evil, the two meanings must be divorced, and one of them be dropped. The question is, shall we empty the term of the notion of belief, or of the notion of virtuous character? That the former idea should ever be shaken off, and the word Christian be employed exclusively in a practical sense, to denote those who would be qualified, on reading the gospel, to feel moral admiration for Christ,—in other words, the good of all ages and countries and faiths, appears to me altogether beyond reasonable expectation. We shall more successfully disarm the bigotry which lurks in the double signification of the term, by banishing the idea of character from it, and retaining it simply as a title of belief. There exist *in fact*, and should exist *in name*, two classes of persons; one of which assents to the supernatural origin of Christianity, and the other refuses assent to this notion: and while words descriptive of these two classes are needed in common parlance, the easiest arrangement is, to maintain in currency the appellations *Christian*

and *Deist* for this purpose—a purpose to which the prevailing usage of centuries has consigned them. The obloquy which attends the employment of the latter name should not be permitted to banish it, if it answers well the purposes of language. The best way to tame the sting of evil terms, which ought to carry no reproach, is for good men to take them up and wear them.

EDITORIAL EXCLUSIVENESS.

[THE following letter is from an English Unitarian minister of high standing, and was suggested by *The Inquirer* having, in the interest of a party, mutilated two letters of Dr. Cromwell's—the one which we published in full in our August number, and another, a fraction of which appeared in *The Inquirer* of July 21. The reason alleged for suppressing the latter portion of the second letter is that it "contained unwarrantable imputations upon the students and the Principal of Manchester New College." We have seen the letter, and we can find no ground for this plea. Of the Principal he says—"To the high conscientiousness of the present Principal of Manchester New College, every one who knows him will be ready to testify; but that his sense of moral obligation is not identical with mine, is evident from his declared system of theological tuition." Of the students he does not speak, but he refers to "pupils of the 'New School,'" and the "surprise and indignation which would be excited in his own congregation, were such doctrines broached as too many of them are in the habit of favouring their auditors with." And he adds—"To speak the simple truth, both the surprise and the indignation, I find, *were* excited at Canterbury, before my appointment there, by certain young men of the said 'School,' who 'supplied' in the absence of a regular minister."

In a postscript to his letter, not sent for publication to *The Inquirer*, Dr. Cromwell says—"I speak, it will be seen, of the proceedings in the pulpit at Canterbury as those of 'pupils,' not of Manchester New College particularly, but of the 'New School.' I do not know who the individuals were, nor what proportion of them were from the College, whose language, when engaged in their solemn office, has been reported to me; but I *do* know that, agreeably to such report, the hearers were instructed that the Bible was only another 'fetish,' and a large number of its narrations 'myths,' while the resurrection and ascension of Christ were ridiculed in terms so contemptibly beneath the decent treat-

ment of any pulpit topic, that I will not disgrace the paper I am writing on by repeating them." If these startling statements of Dr. Cromwell be facts—and we have good reason to believe they are—then they are not "unwarrantable imputations," and the only thing "unwarrantable" in the whole matter was *The Inquirer's* suppression of any portion of Dr. Cromwell's letter.—[Ed. Ch. Un.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

August 24, 1866.

Dear Sir,—The majority of Unitarians must have sympathized with your valuable remarks on the refusal of the Editor of *The Inquirer* to insert Dr. Cromwell's letter, entitled "Whither are we Tending." There is obviously nothing in the matter or style of the letter that should have prevented any editor, who gave fair play to the arguments of his correspondents, from placing it in his columns. It is equally obvious, that if the expression of such sentiments as Dr. Cromwell's is to be suppressed, there is no longer any probability that other than one side of the controversy can be carried on in *The Inquirer*. The gist of Dr. Cromwell's argument is to be quashed, because the editor dared not face the conclusions pointed out. The editor, or his favoured correspondents, gives up Divine Revelation, as its meaning is defined in the English language, and he will not permit to be distinctly stated to his readers the consequences of such denial of the especial divine authority of Christ. It may be an amiable weakness on the part of the editor—and I have no desire to be unduly severe on this score—that, as a former student under Mr. Martineau and Mr. Tayler, he follows, or seems to follow, the opinions of these respected gentlemen, and is prepared to endorse what they say; but the injustice done to Unitarian Christians is, that by such blind attachments he is led to transgress the bounds of legitimate editorship, in depreciating the powers and the characters of men, equally with those he receives as authority, entitled to respect and admiration. Such estimable men are consequently driven to decline controversy in a periodical in which their best thoughts are omitted, and their Christian usefulness impaired by one-sided criticism or ungrounded imputations of narrowness and uncharitableness. They have successively seen the best lights and ornaments of their Church, both in England and Ireland, treated with injustice and superciliousness; and it is not to be wondered at if, in the exclusive pages of *The Inquirer*, controversy will have little more than a partizan aspect. *The Inquirer*, which was originally established with much effort and Christian zeal by Unitarian Christians, now appears to treat the *negation of faith* as alone respectable, and is dedicated to the propagation of a Neology which, as far as its influence extends, threatens to land our churches in the bosom of the Establishment, or in the utter rejection of every Gospel truth.—Yours respectfully,

A Lover of Editorial Non-Exclusiveness.

INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATION AT LEWIN'S MEAD.

On Sunday, September 9, the Rev. A. N. Blatchford, B.A., of Manchester New College, was ordained as assistant minister in Lewin's Mead Congregation, Bristol. The Rev. R. B. Aspland conducted the introductory service, at the close of which Mr. Blatchford come forward, and, standing in front of the congregation, was received by Mr. Worsley, who conveyed to him, on the part of himself and his fellow-worshippers, an affectionate welcome to his new sphere of duty. Referring to the principles of the Society, he said, "We are, I need scarcely tell you, a congregation of Protestant Dissenters, meeting in this place, as our forefathers have done for nearly two centuries, to worship God in spirit and in truth, and to testify our love and our obedience to our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. . . . Our ministers expound the truths of religion by the light granted to them, freely and openly. We therefore hope you will feel yourself perfectly free in the position you are entering upon, using your freedom as not abusing it." Mr. Blatchford, in an earnest address, signified his acceptance of the invitation, after which the Rev. W. James, the senior pastor, offered, in a most impressive manner, the ordination prayer. The Rev. W. Odgers, of Bath, in the name of the ministers of the neighbouring churches, offered the new minister an affectionate welcome. And the Rev. W. Gaskell then delivered the charge to the newly-ordained pastor, founding his remarks on Rom. xv. 29—"And I am sure that when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessings of the Gospel of Christ." In the evening, the Rev. R. B. Aspland preached an interesting and instructive discourse to the congregation.

Entertainment.—On September 12, the Rev. David Gordon was entertained at a public dinner at Banbridge, on the occasion of his resigning the pastoral charge of the Second Non-Subscribing Congregation in that town, and retiring from the ministry. The chair was occupied by Thomas Ferguson, Esq., J.P., Edenderry House, and the meeting represented every religious denomination, and all shades of politics.

OBITUARY.

Died, at St. Louis, Missouri, on August 26, Daniel M'Caw, Esq., formerly of Ballycross, Banbridge, and brother of the Rev. John M'Caw, of Killinchy.

Died, at Saharunpore, North-West Provinces, India, on 3rd August, William John Mulligan, Esq., of the Bengal Civil Service, aged 28 years. It is seldom that a more painful duty devolves on a public journalist than that which has fallen to our lot in recording the death of this accomplished and amiable gentleman. He was the only son, and only child, of the Rev. James Mulligan, minister of

the Remonstrant Congregation of Moira, by whom his early education was superintended. At a very youthful age he entered the classes of Queen's College, Belfast; and the records of that institution attest not only the careful previous training which he had undergone, but his remarkable zeal for the acquisition of knowledge, and the success with which he prosecuted his studies. He came off victorious in every literary and scientific competition in which he engaged; and scholarships and prizes in unexampled amount, as we believe—certainly in number and eminence never surpassed by those acquired by any other candidate—rewarded his diligence and attested his ability. His life was pure and his manners gentle. He was singularly modest in his demeanour, and became an especial favourite not merely with his teachers, but with his class-mates and all who enjoyed the pleasure of his acquaintance. He had been at first designed for the Presbyterian ministry, in which his father has proved himself an able, learned, and useful labourer; but, before the close of his academic career, he turned his thoughts to the Indian Civil Service, in which he was destined to attain the highest distinction capable of being reached by any one of his age and length of service. At the first competitive examination for that appointment he won the *second* place from more than sixty candidates, and, in fact, if it had not been for his singular modesty he would have gained the first. He was a good Italian scholar, but, not thinking highly of his own attainments, he did not specify that language among the branches on which he was ready to be examined; had he done so, he would have gained as many additional marks as would have placed him at the head of the list. On the second or final examination before starting for India, he was the *first* among the successful candidates. After reaching the land of his adoption, he proved himself as able an administrator as his academic course had shown him to be a gifted scholar. He gained the approbation of all his superiors in the service, with the esteem of his brother officers, the respect of his subordinates, and the gratitude of the natives in all the districts with which he was successively connected; and his promotion was uninterrupted and rapid. There can be no doubt that, had he been spared in life, he was on the way to the very highest honours and preferments in the service of which he was a member; but it has pleased Divine Providence to call him hence at the early age of 28 years. He leaves a wife, and, we believe, two young children, to deplore his loss. His bereaved parents and attached relatives may feel all the consolation which can spring from the assurance of the sympathy of many hearts, in which his virtues and amiable qualities, not less than his paramount abilities, had gained him a place. He was indeed a man made to be loved and honoured, and deeply must they feel his loss. There is no parent who could wish for his son a richer inheritance than that he should—in all save his early death—emulate the career of William John Mulligan: resemble him in his affectionate nature, his purity of character, his integrity, his zeal and energy in the discharge of duty, the friendships which he gained and the respect which he inspired; and his character may be held up as an example and a model to the youth of Ireland and of the British Empire.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] NOVEMBER, 1866. [No. 10.

OUGHT WE TO PRAY TO CHRIST?

THE statement recently made by Dr. Colenso, that there is no Scriptural authority for praying to Christ, has excited some surprise even among those members of the English Church who sympathized with him in the views which he published respecting the Pentateuch, and has drawn attention to an important theological question in quarters which Unitarian sermons and Unitarian tracts seldom reach. For this we have reason to be thankful, as we have little doubt that independent thinkers, in the various sections of the Christian Church, applying their minds calmly to the subject, and deliberately weighing the evidence on one side and the other, will arrive at the conclusion to which some of the ablest divines and best Christians have long ago reached—that the Father is the only proper object of divine worship, and the only being to whom the Christian should pray.

It is evident that, in the examination of such a question, our inquiries should be restricted to the Scriptures, for it is in them only we have authentic information respecting Christ, his person, and his office. When we would understand God, we do not thus limit the range of our investigations, for he is also revealed in creation, in providence, and in the human soul; but to the Scriptures we are indebted for all we know respecting the Son of God; and, when we are led to inquire whether prayer should be addressed to him, we endeavour at once to ascertain what the Scriptures teach on the subject.

We might be led to consider, at the outset of our inquiry, what was the practice of our Lord himself—to whom did he pray?—for his example is in general a safe and infallible guide for his disciples. But here his

example does not fully settle the matter under discussion. We find him uniformly praying to the Father, and we are, therefore, justified in imitating him and addressing our prayers to the Father; but we cannot conceive of Christ praying to himself, while it is quite conceivable that we should pray to him. We must, therefore, look farther than the example of our Lord, in order to know whether, in any of our prayers, we should address and supplicate him. If we should find that the primitive disciples prayed to him; and, still more, if it should appear that, in the instructions which he gave his disciples, he taught them to pray to him, there would be no room, we conceive, for hesitation on the subject. Accepting Christ as our Master, and receiving the Gospel as embodying a faithful record of his life and doctrine, there would be no room for doubt and no ground for appeal. It would not necessarily follow that Christ is Jehovah, for there have been those—Socinus and his followers, for example—who habitually prayed to him, although they disbelieved in his Deity; and we know that the members of the Roman Catholic Church pray at least as frequently to the Virgin Mary as either to God or Christ, and they have no belief in her Deity. But if it should be found that the recorded words of Christ do not enjoin prayer to him, and that the primitive disciples—and especially the apostles—did not pray to him, then neither the authority of churches nor the practice of Christians for generations, can justify the Protestant at least, in addressing his devotions to Christ, for he accepts the Scriptures as his rule of faith and practice, and acknowledges Christ as his only authorized teacher in matters of religion.

It happens, unfortunately for our inquiry, that we have, in the history of the apostles, as contained in the New Testament, a report of only a very few of the prayers which they offered up, and even of these the account is exceedingly meagre, but it may be sufficient to indicate their habitual practice. When Peter and John, after being released from prison and threatened by the High Priest and others, returned to the company of believers, and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them, the joy and faith of the church

sought expression in thanksgiving and prayer,—"They lifted up their voice with one accord to God, and said, Lord, Thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is; who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed," &c.* So we read that Paul and Silas, when in prison, "prayed, and sang praises unto God."† Other prayers, and references to prayer, are found in the Acts of the Apostles, but they are not so explicit as to enable us to argue from them; certainly, however, they give no ground for supposing that the apostles prayed to Christ; while we have, scattered through the epistolary writings of Paul and others, abundant evidence that their habitual practice was to pray to God only, generally as the Father, and often as the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus Paul says, "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."‡ The practice of the earliest disciples might be sufficient to teach us what were Christ's instructions on this subject, for we may presume that they obeyed the directions of their Master in their devotions; but, happily, we have another source from which we may learn the mind of our Lord—even his own words. At one time—so the Evangelist Luke minutely informs us—the disciples came to him and said, "Lord, teach us to pray;" and, in reply, he dictated to them what has been appropriately called the Lord's Prayer, in which he instructs them to pray to their FATHER in heaven, and he does not hint that they should pray to him at all. And still more decisive are the instructions he gives them afterwards, when he teaches them to pray to God in his name, and says, "In that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give you."§

Some theological questions there are which it is very difficult to decide by reference to Scripture, the evidence appearing to be conflicting; but in this question all the

* Acts iv. 24—30. † Eph. iii. 14. ‡ Acts xvi. 25. § John xvi. 23.

evidence appears to be on the one side. The principal arguments which have been adduced on the other side are two—the language of the dying Stephen, and the circumstance of Christians being described as those "who call upon the name of the Lord." In the case of Stephen, if it be borne in mind that the dying man is represented as seeing Jesus at the right hand of God, it will not seem strange that he should thus address his Redeemer and Mediator—"Lord Jesus receive my spirit," as if through him, in whose cause he had suffered martyrdom, he should be introduced into the mansions of bliss. The Christians are appropriately designated as those who "appeal to" Christ, or "look to him for salvation,"—such is sometimes the meaning of the verb translated "to call upon;" it signifies not only to call upon, but also to appeal to, or to look to one for succour. When Paul sought the protection of the Roman Emperor, he said, "I appeal unto Cæsar."* Here it is the same verb which is so often rendered "to call upon." And when we remember that in Christ is our hope, and that to him and his gracious promises we look for pardon and redemption, we may easily understand why the disciples should be distinguished as those who "call upon the name of the Lord," without supposing that they were accustomed to pray to him. We know that it was neither their doctrine nor their practice to address him in prayer.

The argument in favour of praying to Christ, drawn from the passages in the Gospels, in which some are represented as *worshipping* him, is undeserving of notice. Every Sunday-school pupil should know that the word *worship*, at the time when our translation of the Scriptures was made, was not employed exclusively to denote the adoration of God; but was often used to express homage or reverence towards human beings. It is employed in this sense in our translation of the Scriptures,† and in other compositions of a similar date. Many passages from old writings might be quoted in illustration. The most familiar is a passage in the Church of England Marriage Service,—"With my body I thee *worship*."

Everywhere in the New Testamant Christ is represented as the Mediator, through whom or in whose name

* Acts xxv. 11. † Matt. xviii. 36.

we are to come to God, and pray to Him. Thus, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, He will give you." "At that day ye shall ask *in my name*." "In the name of Jesus every knee should bow." "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." Many such passages might be quoted from the Gospels and Epistles, placing Christ most prominently before us as the Mediator. Now, if we pray to him, we put aside his Mediatorial office, and, as we conceive, directly violate his most explicit instructions. He cannot be at the same time the object of prayer and the medium through which our hearts approach that object: we cannot at the same time pray *to* him, and *in his name*: therefore, if we are to pray in his name, as he has so plainly and repeatedly taught us, it is evident that we are not to pray to him.

In support of the view that prayer was, in the early ages of the church, addressed to Christ, a passage has been frequently quoted from a letter of Pliny to Trajan, in which he states (on the authority of some who said they had been Christians, but who had deserted the religion), that Christians in their assemblies were "accustomed to sing together a hymn in alternate parts to Christ, as to a God." This passage is regarded by many as satisfactory evidence that the primitive Christians worshipped Christ: but if we bear in mind that Pliny was accustomed to heathen worship, and that those who informed him of the practice of the disciples were, we may presume, believers in many heathen divinities, we need not be surprised that any hymns celebrating the work of Christ would seem to them to ascribe to him such a divinity as their own gods possessed. The passage really shows that the early Christians, in their religious service, dwelt with gratitude on the Saviour; and similar sentiments, we rejoice to think, are prominent in the religious service of Christian Unitarians in our own time. We might quote from many of our hymn-books verse after verse embodying such views. Thus:—

"Jesus, thou light of men!
Thy doctrine life imparts;
Oh may we feel its quickening power,
To warm and glad our hearts."

And we might, from any Unitarian hymn-book, even the most rationalistic, quote many verses to show that what Pliny remarks of the early, is also true of the latest and most heretical disciples; but it affords no proof that the primitive Christians prayed to Christ. In opposition to such evidence drawn from early writers, we might place that of Origen, who, in his treatise on Prayer, says—"If we understand what prayer is, it will appear that it is never to be offered to any originated being, not to Christ himself, but only to the God and Father of all, to whom our Saviour himself prayed, and taught us to pray." Origen lived in the earlier part of the third century; he was distinguished for his learning and talents, and was looked up to as an authority in the church. We may presume that the opinion which he expresses in this passage, was that commonly entertained by the Christians of his time. Soon other opinions gained ground; Christ began to be regarded as the second person of the Trinity, and to be worshipped as God: but if we are to gather our views of Christian doctrine and duty from the Scriptures, and from Christ himself, we shall be constrained to admit that, while we should pray always in the name of our Lord, we should never pray to him, but, like Paul, should bow our knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and when we pray, say, *Our Father who art in Heaven.*

THE MUSIC OF THE SEA.

CASTLE ROCK, COUNTY DERRY.

THE ocean-waves are bounding fast to-day
Along the tawny sands; upon the sight
Flash long-continuous lines of dazzling white,
One moment seen, then broken into spray.

And as they fall on the resounding shore,
Swells on the freshening breeze a wondrous strain—
The wild mysterious music of the main—
That echoes through my heart for evermore;

Echoes—when wandering over vale or hill—
I pause to meditate; at break of day,
At eve, or when 'mid busy crowds I stray,
Even in my dreams that music haunts me still.

Sweep on! ye billows, to the expectant shore,
Your long, tumultuous race is almost run;
From the far land beyond the setting sun
Has been your pathless course—your task is o'er.

Bring ye upon your wings sweet words of balm,
Gushing from some brave heart when storms were high?
Or tones of deep despair, or sympathy?
Or smiles and laughter born on seas of calm?

Or are they thoughts of other lands ye bring?
Where birds of emerald float o'er perfumed flowers,—
Where skies are cloudless, and where dreaming hours
Steal o'er the soul, and leave it slumbering.

Or are they memories of some other sphere?
Where once we dwelt—mayhap shall dwell again,—
Some spirit-land, unseen to mortal ken,
Beyond the severance of our sojourn here.

Or can it be that Nature's self, perchance,
Speaks with a thousand thrilling whispers here?
Breathing, through *you*, her secrets to an ear
Too dull to catch their deep significance.

I cannot answer, yet I know full well,
While thus I listen to your weird-like voice,
I neither sorrow quite, nor quite rejoice,
For human feelings fade beneath your spell.

Strange and mysterious Music of the Sea!
Oh, may it sound for ever in mine ear!
Although I may not learn its meaning here,
All shall be taught me—in Eternity.

A. O'D. T.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 230.)

X.—Robert Acheson (1792 to 1799) was the tenth Presbyterian minister who had charge of the Congregation of Glenarm, so far as my present *knowledge* enables me to determine. If the *surmise* which I hazarded in a previous paper be correct, and if Mr. John Lee officiated there between Mr. Darroch and Mr. Creighton, then the gentleman with whom we are now concerned would occupy the eleventh place on our list.

Mr. Acheson was the nephew, as well as the assistant, of Mr. Read, his predecessor in the Glenarm pulpit, his mother being that gentleman's sister. His incumbency in Glenarm extended from 1792 to 1799, but throughout the whole of that period he was no more than an assistant minister. His uncle, Mr. Read, though he retired from the active duties of the ministry in 1792, survived till 1812, and as during all that time he, as senior minister of Glenarm, received the small annual sum which in those days was allotted as Royal Bounty to the minister of each Presbyterian congregation in Ireland, it follows that Mr. Acheson never enjoyed the full honours or emoluments of the pastoral office in the congregation whose history I am now writing. I am afraid, therefore, that his professional income whilst assistant minister of Glenarm must have been very limited indeed.

Mr. Acheson was the son of James Acheson, by Elizabeth Read, his second wife. His father came originally from Dervock, in the Route of this county, but settled at Clough (near Ballymena), where the future minister of Glenarm was born in 1763. He and another son (whose descendants are now living near Broughshane) were the fruit of their father's second marriage. Descendants of the first marriage, of the name of Acheson, are still to be found in Cairncastle and the neighbourhood of Glenarm.

Mr. Acheson received his collegiate education partly at Edinburgh and partly at Glasgow. He was originally intended for the medical profession, and with that view

went through the whole course of preparatory study at the former of the two universities which I have named. He even practised for a short time as a Doctor of Medicine in Coleraine; but, marrying Miss Elizabeth Smith, of Spittal-hill, near that town, he turned his attention to the Christian ministry, and, leaving his young wife under her father's roof, went to Glasgow College to pursue his theological studies, in order to his assuming the clerical office in the Irish Presbyterian Church. After his settlement with a congregation, Mr. Acheson does not appear to have resumed the regular practice of the medical profession; but as, during his ministry, he occasionally acted gratuitously as physician to the bodies as well as to the souls of his people, and as he really had received a medical education, it is not surprising that he is still sometimes spoken of in this neighbourhood as Doctor Acheson. On entering the ministry, Mr. Acheson seems to have connected himself, from the first, with that party in the Irish Presbyterian Church which was commonly called New-Light; and it is said that his father was obliged to do penance in his own congregation for having gone to hear his New-Light son preach his first sermon. Previously to his settlement in Glenarm, Mr. Acheson resided for some time in Cairncastle, and taught school in the Session-room of Cairncastle Meeting-house. One of his Cairncastle pupils is still living—Miss Baillie, of Ballygilbert—who, though now in the 95th year of her age, tells me that she distinctly remembers the teacher of her youth, and in particular being present, with others of his scholars who are long since dead, at his ordination in Glenarm.

Mr. Acheson was ordained in Glenarm by the Templepatrick Presbytery, as assistant to his uncle, Mr. Read, towards the end of 1792. The exact date of his ordination I cannot give, because there is no presbyterial record extant of the transaction. But there is no doubt about the year, or the period of the year in which it took place, as Mr. Acheson's name appears for the first time on the roll of the Templepatrick Presbytery on November 6, 1792. For the reason already stated, I am unable to mention any particulars connected with Mr. Acheson's

ordination in Glenarm, further than to say that the sermon on the occasion was preached by the Rev. John Lewson, of Cairncastle, who was then in the 86th year of his age. This sermon was afterwards published under the title of "The Gospel a Plain and Sufficient Rule," and, as I am so fortunate as to possess a copy of this production, I can truly say that it is highly creditable to the learning, ability, and Christian fidelity of the venerable preacher. Mr. Acheson, when ordained in Glenarm, was in the 29th year of his age, and had been four years married.

Concerning the history of the Glenarm Congregation during the seven years when Mr. Acheson officiated there as assistant minister, the extant records of the Templepatrick Presbytery are lamentably destitute of information. Within that time there seems to have been only one Visitation Presbytery held at Glenarm, which was on November 3, 1795. On that occasion, strange to say, the junior minister of the congregation does not appear to have been present. His uncle, Mr. Read, the senior minister, is recorded as having been in attendance; but as the acting pastor absented himself from the meeting, we are not surprised to read (which indeed is the only Minute entered of the day's proceedings), that "although regular notice had been given of the Visitation, no Commissioners attended either from Session or Congregation, and therefore nothing could be done."

About two years after the last-mentioned date, viz., on August 1, 1797, an attempt was made to call Mr. Acheson away from the Congregation of Glenarm. At that time the Crumlin pulpit was vacant, in consequence of the death of Rev. John Gibson, and on the day named, Commissioners from that congregation asked of the Templepatrick Presbytery a hearing, for four Sundays, of Mr. Acheson, of Glenarm, with a view to his settlement amongst them. The request was granted, and a poll was afterwards taken for Mr. Acheson; but the result was not favourable to that gentleman's pretensions. In November, 1797, his friends in Crumlin supplicated the Presbytery for a second hearing of him, with a view to a second poll, which was not then granted; but a similar application being repeated in May, 1798,

was complied with, and a poll was again taken for Mr. Acheson. The result, however, was as unfavourable on the second as it was on the first occasion; and after this date the name of Mr. Acheson no longer appears on the list of candidates for the Crumlin pulpit, to which the late Rev. Nathaniel Alexander was shortly afterwards unanimously chosen.

One month after the last of these occurrences—viz., in June, 1798—Mr. Acheson was involved in events which at one time seemed likely to bring both his ministry and his life to a melancholy close. Eventually they only led to his professional promotion. Like most of the neighbouring Presbyterian ministers of the day, he was implicated in the insurrectiouary movement of '98. A sermon which he preached to his people on the eve of the Rebellion, from the words "Fear not them which kill the body," attracted the unfavourable notice of the local authorities, who seem to have regarded Mr. Acheson's discourse not so much as a clerical persuasive to Christian fortitude, as a military speech before battle, addressed by a designated leader of armed men to his future soldiers. And it must be admitted that, when the Rebellion actually broke out, Mr. Acheson's conduct did not invalidate the suspicions which had been excited by his pulpit performance. He was present at the rustic camp which the Insurgents of the district formed on Bellair Hill, near Glenarm.* His private residence being within a very short distance of that place of rendezvous, his mere presence there might have been accounted for without supposing that he was necessarily an active or approving participator in the movement which had caused the assemblage. It might even have been surmised that, as a minister of the Gospel of peace, he thought it his duty to attend at Bellair in order to preach moderation to an excited multitude. And it is certain—for at his trial it was afterwards gratefully

* This hill had formerly been the scene of gatherings of a more pacific character. Many years ago it was the site of a splendid race-course, where the Earls of Antrim had extensive stables, and kept a large stud of horses. These latter are said to have been seized, on one occasion, by some gentlemen of the neighbourhood, in order to prevent their being used by their noble owner in aid of a rebellious rising in Scotland.

testified in his favour—that on that occasion he did exert himself strenuously on behalf of some loyalist prisoners who had fallen into the hands of his political friends. But I am bound to add, that local tradition uniformly connects other motives than those of a mere spectator, or intercessor, with Mr. Acheson's visit to Bellair Hill on the 7th of June, 1798. One printed account of that day's proceedings says that he "took the chief command of the Insurgents;"* and although this view of the matter is contradicted, I think, by the fact which I have learned from various quarters, that Mr. Acheson appeared at Bellair without either arms or uniform, yet no one who remembers what has now been stated, and also knows anything of the history of this melancholy period in our country's annals, will be surprised to hear that shortly after Mr. Acheson's attendance, from whatever motive, at the camp on Bellair, he was arrested, and brought to a strict account for so very suspicious a procedure. He was tried, with other prisoners similarly situated, by court martial, in Belfast. On this occasion he was his own advocate, and in that capacity defended himself with consummate adroitness and more than the proverbial success of such pleaders. A report of the proceedings at his trial was printed at the time, and I have been told by a venerable friend who had seen and read that production, that the questions which were put by Mr. Acheson, on their cross-examination, to the witnesses who were produced against him, were singularly pertinent and effective. He was acquitted, principally, I believe, through the kind offices of the President of the court martial, Colonel Leslie, of Glasslough, who was then in command of the Monaghan Militia. That amiable gentleman was most favourably impressed with the manner in which, on this trying occasion, the minister of Glenarm conducted his defence, and

* "*Annals of Ulster*; *or, Ireland Fifty Years Ago. Compiled by Mr. S. M'Skimin, Author of 'History of Carrickfergus.' Belfast:* 1849." The manuscript of this posthumous work was for a time in my possession, and on looking over it I had reason to think that its author, my late friend, in his excessive anxiety for minuteness and accuracy of detail, was sometimes misled by his informants. Indeed this is a danger to which all local investigators are pre-eminently exposed.

not only exerted himself effectually to save his life, but ever afterwards distinguished him with his private friendship and affection. Mr. Acheson, on his part, shortly afterwards gracefully expressed the sentiments which he entertained towards his gallant deliverer by giving the honoured name of Leslie to his only son.

Other persons besides Colonel Leslie regarded with admiration the appearance and conduct of Mr. Acheson on this occasion. The Fourth Congregation of Belfast, commonly called Donegall Street, was then without a minister, having lately lost its pastor, Rev. James Bryson. Immediately after Mr. Acheson's acquittal, a cordial and unanimous call was presented to him from that congregation, which he accepted, and, resigning the pastoral charge of Glenarm, he removed to Belfast in 1799, where, after a ministry in the latter town of twenty-five years, he died on February 21, 1824, in the 61st year of his age, and the 32nd of his service in the Christian ministry.*

* Mr. Acheson (as stated in the text) married Elizabeth Smith, of Spittal Hill, near Coleraine. The date of their marriage was April 2, 1788. Mrs. Acheson's sister married Mr. Wolfe, a nephew of the unfortunate Lord Kilwarden, who was killed in 1798. Both ladies are still spoken of as having been remarkably fine-looking women, of imposing appearance and manner. By his marriage with Miss Smith, Mr. Acheson had five daughters and one son. Of the daughters, four married husbands whose names were, respectively, Tennent, Smith, Carleton, and Harrison. Many descendants of these several marriages are still living, mostly, I believe, in Dublin or the neighbourhood. One of Mr. Acheson's daughters died unmarried. Of Mr. Acheson's six children, Mrs. Smith, the second daughter, is now the sole survivor. She resides in the city of Dublin. Mr. Acheson's only son, Mr. Leslie Acheson, was twice married, (1) to his cousin, Matilda Smith, of Spittal Hill, near Coleraine, by whom he had one son, who died very young; (2) to a Miss Tracy, by whom he had one son and one daughter, who, with their mother, are living in Dublin Mr. Leslie Acheson died several years ago. During his ministry at Glenarm, Rev. Robert Acheson resided for a time at the Minniss, where (as previously at Cairncastle) he taught a school. He afterwards lived at a place called Tullyotter, near Bellair, on a farm which is now occupied by his grand-nephew, George Acheson. Mr. Acheson is still remember by a few people in the town and neighbourhood of Glenarm, who describe him as having been a large man, of dark complexion and very pleasant address. Of his religious opinions while at Glenarm I have heard nothing more definite than that he denied the Calvinistic doctrine of fore-ordination. But in those days religious matters were not much attended to. After his removal to Belfast, in 1799, Mr. Acheson resumed the occupation of teaching school, in which he was assisted by a Mr. Lyons. He was also a frequent contributor to the pages of *The Belfast Magazine*, but, beyond these occasional pieces

THE FUTURE LIFE.

BY REV. A. P. PUTNAM, OF BROOKLYN.

(Concluded from page 302.)

Nor do we accept the idea or doctrine that the status in which the soul finds itself conditioned, as it enters upon its future life, is fixed and irrevocable for ever. As death has no power to effect a change in the essential character of one's spiritual nature, so it has none, we believe, to destroy his free moral agency. There is nothing in Scripture, or in reason, that teaches us that man will not still be the creature of motives, capable of voluntary choices, and subject to the influences of life's ever unfolding revelations and phenomena. If one who is admitted to the society of the angels should *desire* to surrender his blessed inheritance and accept the portion of the unbelieving and impenitent, who shall say that he cannot and may not do it, however improbable it is that his choice will lie in that direction? Or, if one who goes forth into the future still an alien from God and the blessedness of the heavenly life, should repent of his evil courses, loathe the sin that has reigned over him, hunger and thirst after the immortal good, and aspire to something nobler and better, what shall hinder? Does God at death annul and annihilate for ever the power of the soul to will and to do freely and fully whatsoever it listeth? There is no sufficient authority for such a belief. Is it said that the soul, by its life of sin and of its consequences here, renders itself unable to rise above its helpless, undone condition there? The history of spiritual life on earth shows

I have not heard that he published anything. He was always, however, recognized amongst his contemporaries as a man of literary tastes and attainments. His funeral sermon was preached, in 1824, by the late Dr. Montgomery; and I have heard that a tablet to his memory was erected within the walls of the meeting-house in Donegall Street, Belfast, where he officiated for a quarter of a century, but nothing of the kind is now visible there. In a brief obituary notice, which appeared simultaneously and identically in the *Belfast News-Letter* and *Northern Whig*, Mr. Acheson is spoken of as "possessing great natural talents, and the kindest and most affectionate disposition; as being distinguished as a public man by an enlightened zeal in the cause of civil and religious liberty, and in private life by benevolence, friendship, and hospitality." His widow survived him only a very few years, dying in 1828 or 1829.

that no soul can sink so deeply in moral evil as to lose entirely its power to rise by the divine aid; and who will dare to limit the reach and the might of infinite grace?

"I dare not fix with mete and bound
The love and power of God."

And if it be urged that no sufficient motives and inducements will be held out in the future to dissuade the sinner from his sad career, and attract him to goodness and God, it may, we think, be said in reply that the soul will there have even a *more vivid* apprehension of the consequences of transgression than it could possibly have here; that many of the temptations which now beset it, and which are incident to a life in the flesh and in a world like this, cannot attend it then; and that in the great spiritual universe such wondrous manifestations of God's glory will disclose themselves to view, and such mighty and unprecedented agencies and instrumentalities will be employed to complete the grand redemptive work of Christ, that the sufferer must feel the force of unwonted influences and considerations drawing him on and up to heaven. Yes, we believe that repentance is possible in the life that is to come, as well as in the life that now is. And to suppose that whenever, now or hereafter, the soul is truly penitent, and cries for mercy, and struggles for deliverance and blessedness, God is relentless and unmoved, is to make the Deity a passionless and cruel tyrant, and to set at nought the whole tenor of his Holy Word. It is to attribute to him a character which we should abhor in any earthly parent or friend. A God like this is not the one that Christ has revealed to us—infinitely tender and pitiful—ever longing and yearning for the return of his children, and quick and glad, like the father of the prodigal son, to run forth and welcome his wandering offspring, the moment he sees them come back to the paternal embrace and mansion.

And this turning to God, of which I speak, is, we believe, to be, sooner or later, the act and experience of every soul that he has made. Accordingly, we reject the doctrine that any portion of the human race, any child of the Infinite Father, will lie down in everlasting torments. The popular doctrine of future eternal punishment, however its more skilful and cultivated defenders may seek to

relieve it of its fiercer aspects, and make it more acceptable to refined and humane people, is one which seems to us utterly inconsistent with the thought of God's infinite love, wisdom, and power, at war with all the best sentiments, instincts, and ideas of the human mind, and at variance with the general teachings and prevailing spirit of the New Testament.

The nature, the attributes of God, are the sure pledge of the final extirpation of sin and suffering from the universe, and the commensurate reign, at last, of righteousness, peace, and joy.

There is no word that so fitly describes the very essence and character of the Divine Being as *Love*. God *is* love. That a Being whose name and nature are love itself would create a soul and endow it with immortality, knowing at the same time that it would choose for itself a continued life of sin, and, in consequence, be endlessly and unspeakably miserable in hell, is a proposition whose unreasonableness seems too apparent to merit serious refutation. Infinite goodness would surely *desire* and *will* the ultimate and eternal happiness of every intelligent creature, and would never rest content so long as a single soul remained still a stranger to the life and bliss of heaven.

What the *Infinite Love* would thus *require*, *Infinite Wisdom* could devise methods and instrumentalities to *accomplish*. The goodness of God is no blind force, subject to the caprices of fortune and the contingencies of defeat. Its forecast is as measureless as its kindness, its ways as sure as is its wish. If it be the will or desire of the Divine Benevolence that all shall at length be holy and happy, the Divine Wisdom is abundantly able so to order or arrange the course and affairs of Providence that this glorious result may be attained.

Then what God's *love* is good enough to *dictate*, and what his *wisdom* is adequate to *plan*, his infinite *power* is sufficiently mighty to *fulfil*. As no event can possibly occur to surprise the beneficent, preordained arrangements of his wisdom, so is there no antagonistic element or agency in the universe that can defy his omnipotence to rob it of its victory. His infinite *love*, we say, requires the salvation, at last, of *all*. His infinite *wisdom* cannot fail to discover the needed *way*. His infinite power is

ample to execute all that his *goodness* prompts him *to do;* and his *wisdom* directs him how to *perform.*

If, moreover, the doctrine of everlasting punishment is made to involve the idea of the ceaseless continuance of sin in the souls and lives of the lost, God's infinite holiness, also, is pledged to the accomplishment of the sublime consummation to which we look. Moral evil is the one only thing in the universe which God abhors, and which is at war against his righteous government. It would seem that his throne could never be quite secure, as certainly his reign could never be quite complete, except as every trace of its existence shall finally be obliterated from his dominions. His own glory, as well as his very nature, demands that at last it shall cease to be, and any arbitrary, eternal infliction of suffering or vengeance, beyond the hour of its extirpation, would be an act not less cruel and horrible in its spirit than unproductive of any beneficent result.

Or, if it still be urged that God's justice requires that the sinner shall continue forever to be punished after he shall have repented of his wickedness and forsaken it altogether, we claim that the penalties of Heaven's violated law are remedial in their design and character, and that divine justice is never so completely satisfied as when one ceases to do evil and learns to do well. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Repentance, return, restoration, this is all that God asks of us; and when it is secured there is pardon, reconciliation, and peace. How long the memory of transgression may linger still in the mind, and how much the soul, by its life of sin on earth, may be retarded in its great march of progress through eternity, we do not know. But this is not the endless retribution which the popular doctrine of everlasting torment contemplates. Certain effects or consequences of sin may possibly thus endure for ever, or they may not. But we cannot believe that they will, in any event, interfere with the glorious growth, joy, and rest which, we are persuaded, are the never-ending destiny of all who live.

Against this doctrine of the endless damnation of souls in hell, all the finer sensibilities, the humaner feelings,

and the better hopes and prayers of our hearts rise up in united protest. What a commentary upon the dogma in question it is, that, as one of its advocates has recently said, its opposite theory of the final and universal salvation of the race is "the beautiful dream of noble natures." And so it is. Whatever is divine within us, all that is pure, and true, and good, calls for an end, at last, to every form of sin and woe, and for the perpetual and illimitable reign of righteousness and joy. And that which is divine in our own souls is but a transcript of the excellence and love that constitute the nature of our God.

And all this is the general lesson of Scripture as well. However the more gloomy views of the ancient Pagan world, or the fanciful speculations of Rabbinical writers may have affected the minds of the authors of the New Testament, and coloured their allusions to this general subject, yet the prevailing spirit of the Gospel and its apostolic prophecies concerning the great future that is to be, afford us a sufficient foundation for our faith in the cheering, thrilling doctrine which we hold. Christ reveals to us a God who is an infinite Father, and whose love cannot for a moment be measured by the affection of any earthly parent. It is ever, with him, the essential spirit and purpose of the divine being to seek and to save that which is lost. To the words *eternal* and *everlasting*, as he employs them with reference to the future retributions of the wicked, the most enlightened biblical interpreters more and more agree in giving the sense or meaning of only an indefinitely prolonged continuance of time, as when, in other portions of the Bible, they are used to describe the protracted, but by no means never-ending duration of the hills and mountains, or of the possession which the Israelites received as they entered the land of Canaan. And not alone the properly understood language and drift of the writings of the Evangelists, but also the sublime promises and prospects by which the Epistles give character to the mighty future, when an end is put to sin, and death is swallowed up in victory, and God shall be all in all, necessitate the conviction that every being created in the Divine image shall at last be the heir of life and heaven. It were easy

to wage a war of isolated and controverted texts. For every passage which you shall adduce in support of the doctrine of everlasting punishment, I will bring forward another that shall make it ineffectual to your purpose. We choose rather to find out the true spirit of Christ and the general teaching of the New Testament, assured that here is given to us the surest revelation of the mind of God himself. That single parable of the prodigal son is, in itself alone, sufficient to warrant the position we have taken, and to vindicate the views we hold so dear.

Liberal Christianity is a Christianity that recognizes the ceaseless development of the human soul and the everlasting progress of the race, in truth, purity, love, power, and happiness. In the great life of sin and change, now or hereafter, the soul or the race may for a time be hindered or set back in its destined course, but it will only be to be carried forward again at length to the realization of some better hope. Mysterious as may seem the spiritual marches and countermarches of humanity, the end and purpose of them all, we believe, is victory and glory. God is, in history and in providence, guiding and overruling all things to the universal good. There is nothing which he has created or permitted in his vast dominions that shall not attest his infinite and eternal love. The experience of sin, perhaps, will but give, by awful contrast, the needed meaning and beauty to the holiness of heaven. Out of the depths of earthly suffering the soul most truly rises to the heights of celestial rapture. Life derives a new significance and splendour from the great fact of death and decay. It is evil, and pain, and death together that will form the dark background of the ever-brightening picture of the immortal life, bringing out into more visible relief and glorious attractiveness the realizations which it portrays. A beautiful dream, if you will; but it is one that is not only in harmony with our best thought of God, the holiest longings of the soul, and the noblest interpretations of the Scriptures, but is the constantly growing faith of Christendom. The sects may profess to believe, and may try to think they believe, the doctrine of everlasting punishment; but they do not and cannot succeed. Ministers may firmly retain it in the creeds of the

churches, but most of them are afraid to preach it, and their audiences will not hear it. Parents who subscribe to it reject it when their unconverted children die. It is a dogma out of which the life has departed for ever. There is not a single doctrine of the popular faith beside, in regard to which there is such a wide-spread, latent unbelief as exists in respect to this. Whatever men may say or subscribe to, their general daily life and conduct show that the idea of the endless agony of all who die in their sins is one that has no hold upon their minds or hearts; and the retention of it, under such circumstances, in their articles of faith, and the persistent attempt which they make to persuade themselves that they accept it and credit it, when they inwardly know they do not and cannot, and when their constant spirit and manner attest so clearly their disbelief of it, seem to us like something that is essentially dishonest and pernicious. The world is coming to accept more cheering and ennobling views of providence and destiny. The best and brightest minds of the Church of to-day have discarded, or are discarding the doctrine. The advanced thought of the philosophical and intellectual world disowns it. The truest tendencies of the age are away from it. Art no longer revels in the delineations of its awful horrors, and poetry finds no more its inspiration in its indescribable miseries, but breathes forth the pure hope and noble faith of humanity —in some such strain as Tennyson, in whose "In Memoriam" are contained, says Robertson, "the most satisfactory things that have ever been said on the Future State:"

"Oh, yet we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt and taints of blood.

"That nothing walks with aimless feet;
That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete.

"That not a worm is cloven in vain;
That not a moth with vain desire
Is shrivelled in a fruitless fire,
Or but subserves another's gain.

"Behold! we know not anything;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every winter change to spring."

The life of progress of which I have spoken is one that necessarily involves a life of action. Strange views have prevailed in the Christian world in regard to what constitutes the rest of heaven. Weary of the sicknesses and sufferings of the body, the temptations and conflicts of life, and the changes and uncertainties of the world around us, men have sighed for a sphere where all might be repose and permanence for ever, and have thought of heaven as a region into which they should enter and be at once perfectly happy, undisturbed, and content, eternally hymning their songs and waving their palms. But this is not the rest of heaven. The rest of the soul, what is it? It is, indeed, a sense of the divine favour; it is a consciousness of purity; it is a likeness to Christ and oneness with God; it is harmony, in its fullest, highest meaning. But it is something besides all this, and something upon which all this is conditioned, and with which it is for ever associated—a wise and vigorous exercise of the powers and faculties of our God-given natures. Growth is a law of our being, and is dependent upon activity. Without work, struggle, and aspiration, we are not happy—we rust and we retrograde. There is always a keen delight in putting forth our energies for some noble object or end, and it is thus that we inevitably develop into what is larger and better. The life of heaven, hereafter as now, is a life of constant, ceaseless exertion, while it must needs be free from the pain, fatigue, weariness, and discomforts which so often attend the exertion of the body here. It is because we always in our minds associate these with the idea of activity, that we so often indulge the hope that our future state will be one of profound tranquillity and inertia. But these constitute no part of the inheritance of the blessed life that is to be. Unencumbered and unembarrassed by the ills of the flesh and the hindrances of its present material surroundings, the soul will there enjoy a freedom which it here has never known, and the very awakening and tension of its glorious, unfettered, and emancipated strength will be to it a zest

and joy more blissful far than the most favoured condition of supine, ignoble security of which it can possibly conceive. It is thus, and thus alone, that the immortal spirit ascends for ever and ever nearer and still nearer to God, more and more comes to be like God, and loses itself deeper and deeper in God's bosom of immeasurable and eternal love.

Heaven, too, is a house of many mansions, a world of innumerable scattered circles and communities of happy residents—of endlessly different stages or degrees of intellectual, moral, and spiritual progress, of infinitely varied interests of life and departments of service, where every good taste and talent can find their legitimate sphere of exercise and enjoyment, and nothing will ever be lost. Not in vain, not without some wise and beneficent purpose and end, has God created his children with such wondrously diversified powers and capacities, endowing each of us with peculiar gifts, and fitting us every one by a discipline all our own, for a certain work and mission which no one else is qualified so well to fulfil. For some distinct and definite object God has made and fashioned us all, and it is for this that his providence is ordered to educate and discipline us. In every period of our earthly life we are reminded how the heavenly Father has sought to prepare us for present duties and responsibilities by previous gifts, instructions, and guidance. The wise improvement of all that he vouchsafes or sends us, is the best possible preparation for any sphere or service to which we may be called. It is so in the life that now is. It will be so in the life that is to come. Life is a perpetual school, and all the lessons and influences that enter into it or belong to it have a vast and most momentous bearing upon life's great future. There, in the mighty world that lies before us, so illimitible in extent, so varied in its interests, so complicated in its relations, so limitless in its opportunities, there will be ample scope for every faculty, and energy, and attainment of which we may be the possessors. The wise shall continue yet to instruct and the seeker still to explore. The benevolent shall find other objects of their disinterested care and love, and the strong and brave, marshal and lead, as of yore, the ranks of the redeemed. The children of song will tune their voices

in heaven to diviner music than they ever discoursed on earth, and the votaries of beauty will there discern more perfect visions of loveliness and grandeur than ever enchanted them here. The lips of eloquence shall be touched with a more celestial fire to speak of the wonders and glories of eternity, and the devotees of science shall enter into fresh and measureless realms of truth and knowledge to discover and unveil their eternal laws and principles. And there, too, is the life of mutual helpfulness and disinterested service, each assisting the rest in every noble way; the strong befriending the weak, the enlightened the ignorant, and the far advanced and the well-experienced in the better world those who come fresh from the earthly shores; while fond affection and tender pity shall descend from the serener elevations of power and peace to bear heavenly succour to the objects of their concern and love on the slopes or vales below, all combining, sympathizing, and working together to reach at length the distant summits above and beyond. Well does the venerable Dr. Beecher say:—"Excepting exemption from sin, intense, vigorous, untiring action is the greatest pleasure of the mind. I could hardly wish to enter heaven, did I believe its inhabitants were idly to sit by purling streams, fanned by balmy airs. Heaven, to be a place of happiness, must be a place of activity. Has the far-reaching mind of Newton ceased its profound investigations? Has David hung up his harp as useless as the dusty arms in Westminster Abbey? Has Paul, glowing with God-like enthusiasm, ceased itinerating the universe of God? Are Peter, and Cyprian, and Edwards, and Payson, and Evarts idling away eternally in mere psalm-singing? Heaven is a place of restless activity, the abode of never-tiring thought. David and Isaiah will sweep nobler and loftier strains in eternity, and the minds of saints, unclogged by cumbersome clay, will for ever feast on the banquet of rich and glorious truth."

Without this prospect of constant and everlasting action, growth, and progress of which I have spoken—without this hope on which I have dwelt, of the ultimate restoration and felicity of all who are created in the image of God, life and providence would be a dark and awful enigma. There would be no sure relief to the soul, and

work would lose its highest inspiration and joy. It is the blessed thought that everything is moving resistlessly and unfailingly on to such an unspeakably glorious consummation, and that all shall yet be well—

> "No wanderer lost,
> A family in heaven"—

it is this that solves every dreadful problem, buoys us up in all our doubts, and fears, and sorrows, and gives a thrill of delight and an unwonted element of power to be and to do all that God requires. It is this that casts a cheerful aspect over all the ways and mysteries of the life that now is and of that which is to come, and makes us strong and brave to go forward to meet whatever the years, the ages, and cycles of eternity may have in reserve for us. And it is this inspiring and uplifting doctrine which, it seems to me, constitutes a vital part of the liberal faith which we profess, and which ought to be more strongly emphasized and more prominently set forth to view by us than it has been in the past. We are, as a denomination, false to our trust, recreant to our principles, unmindful of our opportunity, and heedless of the call of Providence, if we fail to make known to men, as in all the sad, revolving centuries it has never yet been understood, that God is an infinite Father, and that every soul he has made is sealed to glory, honour, and immortality. Thanks to that other large and respectable body of Christians by whom, under much obloquy and persecution, these great truths have been so distinctly enunciated and courageously spread abroad. They have been faithful to the light that was given them, and have done a noble work for the Liberal Church of the future. We may well learn from their example.

Nor can I bring this lecture to a close, without an allusion to a work by which one of our most accomplished scholars has presented this general subject to the religious world in all its relations and bearings, and has made to the theological literature of the century a contribution which entitles him to the lasting gratitude and honour of the Church. Mr. Alger, while still a young man, devoted, for twelve years, what leisure hours he could command in connection with his duties of a regular ministry, to

the investigation of all that men had ever thought or written upon the mighty questions and interests of the future life. With a diligence, thoroughness, and heroism such as but few authors in our own time and country have illustrated, he examined thousands of volumes in English, French, German, Latin, and I know not what other languages, and seemed to ransack the libraries of the world, embodying, at last, the result of his studies in a compact and solid book—"A History of the Doctrine of the Future Life"—which affords an epitome of the opinions and speculations of all ages, countries, and sects, in regard to Death, the Resurrection, the Judgment, and the Rewards and Retributions of Eternity. No one can read this invaluable work without being amazed at the extent of learning and research which was necessary to its completion, and without being struck by the beauty and interest which the writer has thrown around the themes scholastics and theologians have so frequently made dry and repulsive to the general reader. It were well, indeed, if more of us, at a time when books of light and transient value engage so many of our moments and so much of our attention, would only grapple with productions of this weightier sort, pertaining to subjects which concern us all so vitally, and would so master their contents as not to be entire strangers to the scenes and solemnities that soon shall stand forth to our waking eyes.

Be it ours, while moving amidst these shifting, shadowy things of earth, not to be unmindful of the world to which we go. Its stupendous, enduring realities, its exalted and saintly companionships, its rapturous greetings and everlasting re-unions, its inestimable privileges and infinite possibilities, its matchless splendours and overwhelming glories, its joy, its love, its praise, and its rest, God himself overarching, encircling, and filling all, and Christ leading his followers yet to living fountains of waters,—it is these, and such as these, that invite us on, and that, while we are in the world, should lift us above its power and evil, that, when the hour of departure comes, we may go forth with a strong and immortal trust to realize in glad fruition what now is only the object of faith.

"I know not what the future hath
Of marvel or surprise,
Assured alone that life and death
His mercy underlies.

"And so beside the silent sea
I wait the muffled oar;
No harm from Him can come to me
On ocean or on shore.

"I know not where His islands lift
Their fronted palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care.

"O brother! if my faith is vain,
If hopes like these betray,
Pray for me, that my feet may gain
The sure and safer way.

"And thou, O Lord! by whom are seen
Thy creatures as they be,
Forgive me if too close I lean
My human heart on Thee!"

THE NAME GIVEN AT ANTIOCH.

The name of *Christian* is that which the followers of Christ Jesus now generally assume, and which they claim as their rightful property. It is, nevertheless, doubtful whether it was at first adopted by themselves or affixed to them by others. It is found in only three passages of the New Testament. In one of these (Acts xi. 26) it is said to have been given to the disciples at Antioch. In the second (Acts xxvi. 28) it is used by Agrippa, an unbeliever. In the third (1 Peter iv. 6) mentioned as the term applied to the followers of Christ by their persecutors. This seems to show that it was not a name chosen by the disciples themselves. If it had been so it would have occurred more frequently. Assuming it to have been bestowed upon them by the unbelievers among whom they lived, the probability is that it was originally a term of derision. The Romans, and their provincials after their example, were in the habit of employing terms of a like ending—*Pompeians*, *Marians*, *Cæsarians*, *Herodians*—to denote the adherents of the political leaders who were the heads of factions in the state. These factions, being purely personal, necessarily ceased as soon as their

respective leaders were dead. But with regard to the followers of Christ, there was this peculiarity—(Josephus speaks of it in a way which shows that he looked upon it as a very remarkable thing)—that the sect did not expire with the life of its author; nay, that multitudes were enrolling themselves as followers of a leader who not only was confessedly dead, but whom his partisans acknowledged to have been executed as a criminal. This the enemies of the Gospel looked upon as a piece of inexpressible absurdity; and they seem to have marked their sense of the folly of the disciples by affixing to them the name of *Christians* as a nick-name. If such was the real origin of the name—(it is a point upon which no certainty can be reached),—the designation, which was at first given as a term of contempt, became by degrees a name of honour, in consequence of the blameless lives and heroic deaths of multitudes to whom it was applied. It is now in such esteem that to withhold it from any one is regarded as an insult, and resented as a wrong. It is, therefore, worth while to consider briefly what is implied in the word.

Here, happily, there can be little room for doubt in the mind of an honest inquirer—not much room for debate even on the part of a disputatious controversialist.

The historian tells us that "the disciples were called *Christians* first in Antioch." Hence the two words, "disciples" and "Christians," were exactly *co-extensive*. "Christians" denoted the very same individuals who had previously been called disciples; and when adopted by them it meant the very same thing—no more and no less. Now, the term "*disciples*" was assumed by the followers of Jesus, because they took him for "their Master," their *teacher*, their *authoritative instructor*, placed over them by the Heavenly Parent, just as their tutors and schoolmasters had been placed over them in youth by their earthly fathers and mothers. They called themselves his "disciples"—that is, his *scholars* or *pupils*—to denote that they felt themselves bound to accept, and that they did accept, his teachings as decisive utterances,—as utterances which they were no more authorized to dispute or reject than a child in a class-room is permitted to rise up and contradict the instructions of its teacher. This seems to me to be

plainly conveyed. The two terms, "*Christian*" and "*disciple*," are clearly connected together as words of the same import and application. Those who were formerly called by the one denomination were henceforth distinguished by the other. Whatever of a doctrinal character is implied in the former designation is henceforth equally implied in the more recent one. The latter may, indeed, have had at first the superadded idea of contempt and ridicule; but, if so, it has lost it for many generations; and the two terms are at present exactly the same in signification.

If I am right in these criticisms (in which I have the concurrence of a whole host of divines of almost every Church—indeed, of some divines of every Church, so far as I have the means of ascertaining), it follows that to be a Christian is to be *a disciple*—that is, *a scholar or learner of Christ*—a pupil of Jesus, who sits at his feet, hears his instructions with reverence, submits to his teachings, and never thinks of disputing his authority. The Christian, having thus enrolled himself as a pupil of Christ Jesus, is, of course, desirous of knowing all that his Master is capable of teaching; whether of *truth*, that he may believe and profess it, or of *duty*, that he may do it and obey it. This is implied by his coming to Jesus as the Great Teacher, and placing himself among his pupils or followers. But I would observe that a pupil is not expected, nor is he required, to know *all* that his master knows. It is sufficient to entitle him to the name of disciple that he be willing to learn from his instructor—to acquire from him all the knowledge that he is capable of taking in. A teacher may know much more than it would be desirable to attempt to teach the learner at the outset of his studies; and it may occasionally happen that a child, from heedlessness or want of capacity, may be unable fully to comprehend some of the topics treated of in his master's lessons. Still, if he is really willing to learn —if he believes that his teacher only tells him what is true and good—if he embraces all that he understands of the lessons that he receives, and even when he falls into error *thinks* that he is following the master's instructions—if, when he finds that he has in any respect mistaken his teacher's meaning, he is prepared at once to retrace his steps, to renounce the erroneous interpretation which he

had put upon the master's words, and to adopt what he now believes to be their just intent and proper meaning,—no man can justly or properly deny his claim to be acknowledged as a *disciple*—that is, a pupil or follower of the master, to whose authority he bows thus submissively; whose authority he believes that he is following, even when, through frailty, he is deviating from his instructor's teachings most widely. Just so with respect to a Christian—that is, a disciple or follower of Christ. He may not know all that the Saviour knew of religious truth—all of moral duty that the Saviour had it in his power to teach. What living man can truly pretend to know as much of God and of divine things as Christ the Saviour knows or knew? He may fail to have given proper attention to some of the sayings that fell from the Great Teacher's lips; or, even when he gave his best attention, he may have experienced the common lot of frail humanity—he may have misapprehended the Saviour's meaning, and put a wrong signification upon his words. Still, if he owned his authority as a teacher sent from God—if he felt his obligation to believe all that he taught for truth, and to practise all that he enjoined for duty—if he was earnestly desirous of fulfilling this obligation, and humbly endeavoured to fulfil it—if, when he found that he had misconceived the Saviour's teaching, he was willing to abandon the error into which he had fallen, and if he did cheerfully abandon and renounce any such mistake as soon as it was discovered—no man, in my humble opinion, is authorized to withhold from him the name of Christian—that is to say, the name of disciple and follower of Christ, or to reject his title to the Christian character, privileges, and hopes.

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

REVIEW.

THE NEW MOVEMENT AND THE NEW CHURCH, AN INDICATION OF PRINCIPLES AND A PROPOSAL FOR A NAME. Whitfield, Green, & Son, London.

THIS pamphlet has reference to the new movement recently made by several leading members of the Unitarian denomination to strip

the Unitarian Association of its dogmatic character; or, failing in this, to establish a new Association, or rather a new Church, whose basis shall be simply the Christian "pieties and charities," and which shall recognise no dogma whatever. The author, we are happy to find, entertains no expectation that the British and Foreign Association can be so modified as to meet the wishes of those who disapprove of its present dogmatic character; and we confidently hope that the efforts now being made to strip it of its distinctive principles will utterly fail. That Association is, in no just sense, an ecclesiastical organization—it assumes no authority in the various congregations of liberal Christians in the country—it is merely a voluntary society, established mainly for the promulgation of the great Christian truth that God is one being in One Person, and for the protection of the religious liberties of those who hold and avow that important doctrine; and when we remember that the vast majority of Christians, Protestant as well as Catholic, have failed to apprehend the oneness of God, and have sought to put down by persecution or obloquy those who entertain this view, we should admire the wisdom and courage of those who founded such a society, and endeavour, by our contributions and labours, to sustain it and extend its operations. But there can be no reasonable objection to the organization of a Church on any basis which its promoters may p'ease. The "new movement" aims at founding a Church which shall prescribe no doctrines as required for membership, but simply seek to unite men of the most diverse theological opinions in the cultivation of the "gentle and holy spirit" of Christ. This is the view which the pamphlet before us advocates. The writer contends, with much ability, for a New Church, which, he fondly expects, may, in the progress of time, attract to itself the good and true of opposing sects; and the name which he suggests, as being at the same time the most simple and comprehensive, is *the Catholic Christian Church*. We have more than once given our views of this "new movement." It is a Utopian scheme, into which none can be expected to enter but a few sentimental Christians, and such as are practical unbelievers. Men who have faith in the mission of Christ will not sink this principle—dogma, some call it—in order that they may unite in Church membership with those who regard him as nothing more than a pious Jew. Men who believe in the reality of the Saviour's resurrection, and the momentous truth which in Scripture is linked with it—even our own resurrection from death—will not consent to have such a doctrine put aside, to meet the doubts or disbelief of those who wish to be in a nominally Christian Church, while they hold no distinctively Christian principle. The term "Church," which the author suggests as a part of the name, may be quite unobjectionable, for there may, we suppose, be a Church of any class of believers or unbelievers. In this connection it simply indicates an Assembly or Association. The term "Catholic," in one point of view, is expressive enough, for, signifying "universal," it suggests that all may join the Church. There is no limit or restriction—Jew, Christian, Deist, Mohammedan, are alike admissible. But in another sense Catholic would be a very inappropriate term; for we have no idea that any would join it save those who are really unbelievers, and those who, supposing themselves Christians, are

willing to sacrifice principle to peace, and who, under the plea of religious liberty, make common cause with the enemies of Christ. "Christian" in no right sense could be applied to such an organization. "Christ" implies something more than "the gentle and holy spirit" of our Lord; and if men are prepared to abandon the distinctive principles of Christianity, we think they should also drop the name. This New Church, "open to all the world," as our author says,—let it be called in such a sense "Catholic," but not Christian. Might it not more correctly be termed "The New Catholic Church?"

And yet, after all, there is not so much that is *new* in such a movement. Ireland, we think, has anticipated our English brethren, as, for several years, we have had a church in Ulster embodying, virtually, the same loose or "catholic" principles for which they now plead. "Non-Subscriber" has been so interpreted as to include non-believers, and its etymology may seem to justify the interpretation; and the church to which we refer asks no questions; its courts are "open to all the world;" here is the seat of "absolute religious liberty;" and without inaugurating any new church, we suggest that this older one should be extended to England; its freedom is as ample, and its principles as loose, as the most fastidious or sceptical should desire; and then, instead of the name which our author recommends, might be employed another as simple and as comprehensive, "The Non-Subscribing Catholic Church."

INTELLIGENCE.

WEST OF ENGLAND AND SOUTH WALES BOOK AND TRACT SOCIETY.

THE seventy-fifth annual meeting of this Society took place at Devonport on September 5. The service was held in the beautiful church recently erected. The introductory services were conducted by the Rev. P. Bakewell, of Halifax, and the Rev. W. A. Jones, of Taunton. The sermon was preached by the Rev. R. B. Aspland from Rom. viii. 14, 15. After ably illustrating the text, the rev. gentleman observed that the usual way of supporting a scheme of Christian doctrine by arranging a set of texts in its favour had not succeeded. Sects still multiplied, each having the same confidence in its textual arguments. He, therefore, proposed on that occasion to dwell not so much on direct Scriptural proofs as upon certain moral presumptions which favoured a rational and liberal system of theology like that professed by Unitarian Christians. A true religion would have some appearances in its favour in the face of the sacred volume, in the history of the human mind, in the working of society, and in the course of events under God's Providence. In declining on that occasion to defend the Unitarian faith by textual arguments, the rev. gentleman deprecated the conclusion that there was any justice in the statement attributed to Pro-

fessor Vaughan, that Unitarians had abandoned the field of Scripture, because they knew that for them it had no harvest. So far from this he declared that the rational and liberal faith of Unitarians could be expressed forcibly and fully in the words of the Scriptures. If he wished to express Unitarian doctrine in the briefest and most emphatic terms he felt compelled to use the words of Jesus Christ and his apostles. The preacher then brought forward various arguments from science, and from the tendencies of modern civilization, in favour of Unitarian Christianity, and concluded by an appeal on behalf of the Western Unitarian Society, and alluding to the holy lives and learned labours of men like Kenrick, Estlin of Bristol, Acton of Exeter, and Dr. Carpenter of Bristol, he implored his hearers to imitate their zeal and their godliness, and so to win to Christ and the Unitarian Church good men of all sects and parties. In the afternoon, about fifty ladies and gentlemen dined together, John Bayly, Esq., in the chair. The speakers on the occasion were—Revds. R. B. Aspland, W. A. Jones, P. Bakewell, W. James, and J. K. Applebee. The business meeting was held in the evening at the School-room of Treville Street Chapel, Plymouth, A. Norman, Esq., presiding, and was of a very interesting character.

FREE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, NEW SWINDON.

On Wednesday evening, Oct. 3, a social meeting was held in this Church, to publicly recognise the Rev. J. A. Brinkworth, of Trowbridge, as assistant minister to the Rev. F. R. Young. After singing, and prayer offered by the Rev. John Ellis,

Mr. Young said that he need only "put them in remembrance" of the special object which had now brought them together. They were assembled for the pleasant purpose of publicly recognising their friend, Mr. Brinkworth, as the assistant minister of the Church, and of introducing him to his work. For a long time past the want had been felt of a helper in the work connected with that church, but it was only about six months ago that the way was clearly seen of obtaining the needful funds. About that time an offer of money help was made him, which enabled him at once to ask Mr. Brinkworth to consider the question of coming to Swindon for a permanence. After a careful, and, he was quite sure, conscientious study of the whole matter, Mr. Brinkworth had decided to come. He was glad and grateful that that decision had been made. Mr. Brinkworth would, he was quite sure, do his work in a thoroughly earnest and Christian spirit. He hoped that the congregation would assist their friend by their kindly sympathies, and especially by co-operating with him in works of usefulness. A cold and lazy church was a Christless Church, and a Christless Church was one against which the sentence must, sooner or later, go forth—"Cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground?" Most heartily did he bespeak for Mr. Brinkworth an ungrudging welcome, knowing as he did that that welcome would be given where it was well deserved, and to one who, if his life and health were spared, would earn it to the full.

The Rev. W. J. Odgers then rose to give Mr. Brinkworth the right hand of fellowship. He said: "I cordially welcome you as a brother minister. Remember, we do not at all pretend to confer upon you any authority which you did not before possess: we believe that you have a sufficient call to the work of the ministry in your own earnest wish to make that work the work of your life, and in your own deep feeling of conscientiousness in having endeavoured to prepare yourself for the faithful fulfilment of the important duties of the office. I may further say, that we cannot, as brother ministers, *essentially* aid you in your work here, by which I mean that the character and results of your ministry must depend, under the Divine blessing, upon the energy and devotedness of your own soul, upon your spiritual insight, and your own earnestness, faithfulness, and perseverance. But whatever we *can* offer you in the way of direction or encouragement, as the result of more extended experience and the suggestions of cordial friendship, to that be assured you shall be always most welcome. You are about to enter upon a very important sphere of usefulness, where you will find abundant opportunities for the exercise of your best energy, and where I feel sure you cannot labour in vain if you labour in the spirit of our master, Jesus Christ. And I am quite certain you will be sustained and encouraged in the important work you are about to commence, not only by the counsels of your more experienced colleague, but by the sympathy and co-operation of the friends among whom you will labour. I, therefore, most earnestly pray that you may be a faithful and acceptable minister of the Lord Jesus Christ in this place, that you may be honoured by those whose welfare you endeavour to promote, and approved by the great Searcher of Hearts. And now, with this wish, I beg to offer you, in the name of the ministers of this district, the right hand of Christian fellowship. May God bless you, and make you a blessing. Amen.

The Rev. Samuel Martin could assure the friends present that they were highly privileged in having such a minister as Mr. Young, and now that they were about to receive additional and valuable help, he hoped they would estimate their friends "very highly for their work's sake." Having known them both for several years, he could express his great respect for them, and his very best wishes for their welfare. But although ministers had their special work to do, the congregation also had much to do in promoting the true prosperity of a church. That was dependent upon the members being possessed by scriptural truth, fervent piety, religious growth, ceaseless activity, hearty union, cheerful liberality, and earnest prayer. These particulars were enforced and illustrated in Mr. Martin's well-known happy manner.

The Rev. John Ellis then addressed the congregation, and concluded by urging Mr. Brinkworth to cling to Christ under all circumstances, and expressed his full assurance that God would bless all united, earnest effort to promote the true progress of humanity.

The Rev. J. A. Brinkworth then rose to acknowledge the kindly expressions of regard and sympathy which had been made in reference to himself. He could assure them that he desired to be ac-

cepted as a believer in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and as a worker not for sectarian ends, but to do good as he had opportunity. He asked them to co-operate with him, and to strengthen his hands by their prayers and practical sympathies. He would try to do his duty as in the sight of God, studying to show himself approved unto Him, and leave all the results to that day which would try every man's work of what sort it was.

Mr. W. L. Fallows, secretary of the congregation, offered the friends from a distance very hearty thanks for their presence and help. The meeting was then brought to a close by singing, and a very solemn prayer offered by the Rev. Samuel Martin.

Opening of a Lay Preacher's Library, London.—On Friday evening, October 5, a meeting was held in Stamford Street Chapel for the purpose of establishing a theological library, to aid the lay preachers in the work they have undertaken. S. Sharpe, Esq., presided, and introduced the proceedings by some judicious remarks. The secretary, Rev. R. Spears, reported that already twenty-nine gentlemen, members of the London Unitarian congregations, had consented to take part in the preaching engagements of the Union. During the last three months upwards of sixty services have been held by twenty-two of these gentlemen in twelve different chapels and mission stations. Mr. Spears gave various interesting details connected with the Union, and mentioned several places in which some good had been already accomplished. The meeting was then addressed by several of the lay preachers, and also by the Rev. Dr. S. Davidson and the Rev. J. Bevan, and the proceedings terminated with a cordial vote of thanks to the chairman.

Bolton District Unitarian Association.—The half-yearly meeting of this Association was held at Ainsworth, near Bolton, on October 4. Divine service was conducted by the Rev. George Fox, of Park Lane, and the Rev. Jeffery Worthington, of Bolton, preached from Romans xii. 5. In the afternoon there was a meeting, presided over by the Rev. J. F. Whitehead, of Ainsworth. The minutes of previous meetings were read by Mr. Worthington, and speeches, on matters connected with the Association, were made by the Revs. M. C. Frankland, J. Wright, J. Fox, J. Freeston, and G. Fox, and Messrs. R. Heywood and H. Spencer.

The Rev. Richard A. Armstrong, B.A., late of Manchester New College, and son of the late Rev. George Armstrong, of Bristol, has accepted the unanimous call of the Non-Subscribing Congregation of Banbridge, in connexion with the Presbytery of Antrim, to become their pastor.

We learn, through *The Boston Christian Register*, that the Rev. James Martineau has been a candidate for the vacant chair of Mental Philosophy and Logic in University College, London. It appears that his candidature was supported by the Senate, composed of the Professors of the College; but that, by a combination of parties of entirely opposite opinions, including Broad Church men and Conservative Unitarians, his election was defeated.

OBITUARY.

Died, at the residence of her sister, Meadowbank, Whitehouse, on Oct. 5, Fanny, daughter of the late Rev. Samuel Barber Presbyterian Minister of Rathfriland, aged 88 years. We copy from *The Londonderry Standard*, the following just tribute to the memory of this excellent lady: to the particulars of her life and character which it contains, it is right to add that in her religious principles she was a Christian Unitarian, and that more than half a century ago, she established a Sunday School for the children of her neighbourhood, when such institutions were entirely unknown in that district of the country:—"Miss Frances Barber, or "Fanny," as her friends loved familiarly to call her, was a daughter of the Rev. Samuel Barber, minister of the First Presbyterian Congregation of Rathfriland, during the closing quarter of the last and beginning of the present century, and whose memory is still traditionally cherished amongst the inhabitants of his pastoral district. Mr. Barber was a man of vigorous intellect, an accomplished classical and Hebrew scholar, at a time when Biblical erudition was far less cultivated than at present, while energy of character, and high public spirit, were conspicuous attributes of his intellectual and moral temperament, on all fitting occasions. When Dr. Woodward, Bishop of Cloyne, published his celebrated attack upon the Presbyterian community, Mr. Barber replied in a forcible defence, which the Bishop found it convenient to pass over without notice. The return of the Hon. Robert Stewart (afterwards Lord Castlereagh) as Member for County Down, on the Presbyterian and Independent interest, after a contest of *thirteen weeks*, was also due in a considerable degree to Mr. Barber's popularity, and to his active influence, and his name figures honourably in the history of that stirring period. On the maternal side, Miss Barber was descended from the Rev. Gilbert Kennedy,* one of the early Fathers of Presbyterianism in Ulster, and a near relative of the noble family of Casillis in Scotland, while her own character fully corresponded to the dignity of her historic ancestry. During her prolonged occupation of Tullyquilly, her life was devoted to the material relief of the poor of all denominations, to their educational improvement, and to their social elevation, so that her very name became amongst the populace, for many miles round, both a

* We learn, from a manuscript of Miss Barber, that Gilbert Kennedy had been minister of Girvan, in Scotland, but that in a time of persecution there, he fled, and took refuge in Ireland, accompanied by his brother Thomas, also a minister. Gilbert concealed himself near Comber. Thomas settled in County Tyrone, where his descendants are respectable and numerous. During the administration of Strafford, the Presbyterians of Ireland were almost as ill treated as those of Scotland, so that Gilbert had still great hardships to contend with. He preached in the glens near Comber, in the starlight; and as soldiers were quartered in many of the houses, the people had to leave home after the soldiers were asleep and return before they were up next morning. They carried their children from Lisburn and all the surrounding country to be baptized by him. He was buried in the aisle of Dundonald Church, and his name is inscribed on his tomb.—Ed. Ch. Un.

"household word," and a synonyme for charity and kindness in their most disinterested forms. The same excellent lady also largely devoted herself to the encouragement and assistance of young persons amongst the rural classes, who were anxious to distinguish themselves in educational pursuits, and her intimate connection with many of the most influential families in the Counties of Down, Antrim, and other localities, including Dublin itself, enabled her frequently to do, in this respect, invaluable service on many occasions. During the last twenty years, advancing age had obliged Miss Barber to retire to Belfast, where she has since resided in the family of her only surving sister, Mrs. J. G. Smith, at whose country seat, Meadowbank, Whitehouse, she expired on the 5th instant, leaving behind her the memory of a life consecrated to the noblest exercises of an elightened benevolence, which loved to discharge its missions of kindness away from the applauses, and, as far as possible, even from the knowledge of the great world outside.

Died, at Weyburn, Cairncastle, near Larne, on Sept. 25, John Tweed, Esq., aged 32 years.

Died, at Villa Franca, Bridge of Allan, N.B., on Oct. 12, Sarah, widow of the late John M'Cance, Esq., of Suffolk, and M.P. for Belfast, aged 77 years.

Died, at Ballywoolen, Killyleagh, on Oct. 21, Mary, relict of the late Robert Martin, aged 70 years.

Died, at Craigantlet, parish of Newtownards, on Sept. 29, aged 82 years, Mr. William Moore, for many years a ruling elder, and most regular and valuable member of the First Presbyterian Congregation of Newtownards.

Died, at Donegall Square South, Belfast, on Oct. 24, Marianne, widow of the late Francis Dalzell Finlay.

The Rev. John Pierpont.—This distinguished poet, philanthropist, and divine, died at Medford, Massachussets, on August 26, at the advanced age of 81. He was minister, successively, of the Unitarian Congregations of Holles Street, Boston, of Troy, N.Y., and of Medford, Mass. When the war broke out, he offered his services as chaplain to one of the Massachussets regiments and proceeded to the seat of war; but the exposures of camp life proved too much for his age and infirmities; he therefore resigned his chaplaincy and received a post in the Treasury Department, which he held at the time of his death. Mr. Pierpont was the author of various hymns, now found in almost every congregational hymn book. He also employed his poetic talent in favour of Temperance, of which he was through life an ardent advocate.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 59, Upper Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] DECEMBER, 1866. [No. 11.

DOGMAS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

THERE is a growing tendency among those who, from one cause or another, are opposed to everything definite in religious opinion, to flatter themselves that the primitive church enjoined no distinct dogmas, but simply required from its members and teachers an acknowledgment of the excellence of Christ's character, and of the duty of endeavouring to imitate it. These modern religious thinkers—strangely enough called "the advanced"—seek to strip Christianity of everything dogmatic, and make it to consist merely of "pieties and charities." Not that their piety is a whit more fervent, or their charity at all more enlarged than that of their less sceptical neighbours; we believe, on the contrary, that scepticism tends to stifle piety and to narrow charity.

But is it indeed the fact that primitive Christianity has no dogmas—no definite articles of belief? Far from it. Compared with the numerous and abstruse articles of faith which churches afterwards taught, they are indeed few and simple; but they are not the less definite and important.

Some of the dogmas taught in the primitive church were not peculiarly Christian, but held by Christians in common with many others. Such was the belief in the existence of God, and his unity. That belief, held as distinctly and guarded as jealously by the Jew as the Christian, is an important dogma, and may be regarded as the foundation on which all the others rest. Now, we are informed that, among our advanced thinkers, some hold Atheistic and others Pantheistic principles. What would we think of such persons excusing themselves for uniting with a Christian church and assuming the Chris-

tian name, on the plea that Christianity is not a dogma, but a spirit and a life!

But there are dogmas essentially and exclusively Christian, which are prominently exhibited in the sacred records, and which are so interwoven in the system that no ingenuity of criticism can remove them. Such is the belief that Jesus came from God—that he came not of himself, but God sent him; and allied with this, that his doctrine was not his own, but his that sent him. This fact—dogma it may very properly be called—permeates the whole teachings of Christ and his apostles; and to it we trace the trust that was reposed in the Son of God, the labours that were undergone, the sufferings that were endured, and the victories that were achieved in the name of Christ. Some no doubt there were, attracted in one way or another to Jesus when he was on earth, occasional listeners where he taught, that did not hold this faith: in one sense they were disciples, for they sought to *learn* from him, but in no fair sense could they be termed believers. So in our own times there are some who attach themselves to a Christian Church; in the religious service there is little to offend them, and in the discourses delivered from the pulpit there may be much to please, impress, and improve them; but Christianity is not to them the power which it is to all who can accept the simple and comprehensive test of apostolic times—a belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Doubtless, also, when in various countries and cities the Apostles and the authorised teachers expounded the Gospel of Christ, many may have listened, and to some extent approved of their doctrine, who yet had no faith in the mission of Jesus from God; but we could not conceive of such persons undertaking to explain and defend the Gospel. Had they done so, they must have spoken in some such terms as the following:—"Brethren, we do not believe, as do certain parties like Peter and Paul, that Jesus of Nazareth was specially sent for the instruction and salvation of men: but you must all admit that he was a good man, and that the Jews unjustly put him to a cruel death. He taught much truth about God, and about the duties we owe to ourselves and to one another, and we exhort you to learn of him." It was not by such undogmatic, milk-and-water preaching

that the Apostles roused men from sin and indifference, and won them to the Christian faith and work: nor do we trace anywhere in the primitive records such assumption of Christian profession, combined with such absence of Christian faith. It remained for our own times to witness the humiliating spectacle of men undertaking the office of teachers of Christ, while they have no faith in his mission from God, and while they ridicule such a dogma as rank superstition.

Closely allied with the mission of the Saviour from God, is another dogma held by the primitive church—we mean the Mastership of Christ. It is quite true that they were not always unanimous on this subject. There are evidences presented in the Epistles of Paul, which tend to show that some, for a time, regarded one or other of the Apostles as their Master, and gave their allegiance to him. But these errors the Apostles laboured diligently to correct, and they seemed anxious to sink themselves that they might magnify their Lord. To subject ourselves to the spiritual authority of an ordinary man, however gifted or holy, would be unwise and dangerous; and the fact that Christ is, both by himself and his inspired Apostles, represented as our Master, plainly enough attests his authority from God. Not only in the earliest times, but down through all ages of the Church, the Mastership of our Lord has been acknowledged; other subordinate masters have by some been set up, but his authority has been received by all, if we except a few in our own time who rebel against all dogmas and are impatient of all authority; and they have presumptuously protested against accepting Christ as their Master, while all the time they call themselves Christians! At a recent Unitarian Conference, held at Syracuse, N.Y., strong opposition was given by some to the Lordship of Christ being embodied in their constitution, on the ground that it was a creed—a dogma; but the Christian principles of the majority overruled such objections, and outvoted the sceptical cavillers.

Another dogma of the primitive church was the Resurrection of Christ. We need not stop to show how this great fact stands out in the sacred records and pervades the whole system of Christianity. We believe that,

wherever the Apostles preached, they held forth the momentous truth, that him whom the Jews crucified God raised from the dead,—and no wonder, for to it they seemed to owe the perfecting of their own faith in Jesus as the Christ of God. If Paul had not preached at Athens the resurrection of Christ, he might have had more patient hearers, and might have won popularity from those who only heaped upon him contempt and ridicule. Had he treated the Stoics and Epicureans to an ethical or metaphysical discourse, such as now-a-days is sometimes heard from Christian pulpits, he might have found them willing hearers and ardent admirers; but then he would have been stifling his own holiest convictions, and keeping from them a grand and consolatory truth, which it was his noble mission to proclaim. We are sometimes told that Paul was very tender and considerate towards those who denied the resurrection, and seemed to regard it as an "open question." Connected in some way with the Christians at Corinth were certain persons who denied the resurrection, and Paul seeks not to remove them, but to correct their errors. He does not, however, make light of their disbelief; on the contrary, he says, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." It is well known that, in connexion with various Non-Subscribing Churches of the present day, there are some intelligent and good men who do not believe in the resurrection of of Christ from the dead; and we have always held that it is not the province of the church courts to expel such persons, but, on the contrary, they should be thankful that they attend a Christian ministry, and thus place themselves in the way of Christian instruction. Very different would be the conduct of church courts if they authorised such disbelievers to be teachers and defenders of the Christian faith. That would be to place an enemy in the fortress, and surrender our holy faith to doubt and unbelief.

It seems strange to us that any man, professing to receive the Gospel even as an ordinary and trustworthy history, can argue that primitive Christianity had no dogmas, and no test. That it was free and liberal, as compared with many modern Churches, we freely admit, but that it embraced not only pieties and charities, lessons

of devotion and lessons of duty, but also clearly-defined doctrines, we can see no room to doubt; and our only wonder is, that men possessed of common sense and common honesty can regard it as a trifling matter whether ministers of Christ accept or reject his mission from God, his Messiahship, and a belief in his resurrection from the dead.

A MORNING HYMN.

FATHER divine! in grateful lays
We sing, this morn, thy gracious love;
Accept thy people's joyful praise,
And hear us from thy throne above.

Again with glowing lustre bright
The sun sheds splendour o'er the sky;
Oh, grant our souls a lovelier light,—
Jesus, the day-spring from on high!

As night, with sable gloom, hath gone,
So in our hearts, now dark and drear,
Let Christ with radiant glory dawn—
Our Sun of Righteousness appear.

Thy watchful love in night's dark hour
Hath sent our weary bodies rest;—
We slept beneath thy guardian power—
Our heads were pillowed on thy breast.

And now we wake to life once more—
Again the daylight glads our eyes;
Thy boundless grace and mercy pour
A thousand blessings as we rise.

This day, O God! to Thee we'd spend—
This day in duty's path we'd tread;—
Oh, give thy help—thy guidance send,
And in our hearts thy spirit shed.

No sin to stain this day's brief course,
May we, when comes the evening hour,
Praise but thy goodness as the source
Of safety from the tempter's power.

Death soon shall end this mortal strife—
Time brings us, each returning day,
Nearer the close of earthly life,
Further along the rugged way.

And oh, when all our troubles o'er,
We sink to sleep in death's dark night,
Grant us to wake on heaven's sweet shore
To endless joy, to boundless light!

9th September, 1866. W. B. J. M.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Continued from page* 337.)

XI.—Alexander Montgomery was minister of the old Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm from 1801 to 1853.

During the vacancy between the removal of Mr. Acheson to Belfast in the early part of 1799, and the appointment, in 1801, of Mr. Alexander Montgomery as his successor in Glenarm, that Congregation appears to have been in a very unsatisfactory condition. In those days religion was at a low ebb in all the Presbyterian Congregations throughout the province, but the troubles which overtook Mr. Acheson in connexion with the affairs of 1798 necessarily had a peculiarly depressing effect upon the Congregation of which he was minister. On that gentleman's departure from Glenarm, the Templepatrick Presbytery of course took charge of the pulpit which he vacated, and at its next meeting in Larne on April 4, 1799, generously resolved that that pulpit should be supplied by the Presbytery gratis until the first Tuesday of May, on which day the Congregation of Glenarm were given to understand that they would have "an opportunity of making such applications to the Presbytery as might appear to them proper." At the meeting referred to, no application of any kind was made to the Presbytery on the part of the Glenarm Congregation, nor does that worshipping society seem, for a considerable time, to have taken any steps towards procuring the settlement of a minister amongst them in succession to Mr. Acheson.

Whether or not, during this interval, Mr. Read, the senior minister of Glenarm, who was still alive, did anything towards the stated supply of the Congregation, I cannot say. At length, on August 5, 1800, at a meeting of Presbytery held in Ballynure, a motion was made by Mr. Hill, of Ballynure, who was also the father-in-law of Mr. Read, "that each member of Presbytery should preach one day to the Congregation of Glenarm gratis; and the Presbytery, taking into their serious consideration the situation of the Congregation of Glenarm, resolved that, in order to revive a spirit of religion there, each member should preach one day gratis." This renewed instance of generosity on the part of the Presbytery seems to have had some effect in stirring up the people of Glenarm to a remembrance of their congregational duty; for at a meeting of Presbytery, held in Larne on January 13, 1801, "there appeared from the Congregation of Glenarm an unanimous call for Mr. Alexander Montgomery,* which call was recommended to his most serious consideration by the Presbytery, who also appointed him constant supplier of Glenarm agreeably to the request of said Congregation, and prescribed to him, as a first specimen of second trials, the question—What is the Gospel plan of regeneration? which he was to deliver before the Presbytery at Larne on the first Tuesday of February." It is to be presumed that Mr. Montgomery performed this, and his other pieces of "second trials," to the satisfaction of the Presbytery, although no record to that effect appears on the minutes; for on March 17, 1801, he was ordained by the Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the Congregation of Glenarm. The following is the very meagre minute of his ordination which was inserted by the Clerk of Presbytery in the Presbytery's Book:—

"At a meeting of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, at Glenarm, March 17, 1801 (the day appointed for Mr. Montgomery's ordina-

* Mr. Montgomery was a native of Rasharkin. Before coming to Glenarm he had been an assistant in a highly respectable school which was conducted near his native place by Rev. Mr. Greer, a clergyman of the Established Church. Amongst his pupils at that seminary were the sons of the late Mr. Davison, of Knockboy, some of whose relatives lived in the neighbourhood of Glenarm, and this may have led to Mr. Montgomery's settlement in that place.

tion), the congregation being asked what support they would give Mr. Montgomery, answered that they would give £40 at least.* Mr. Thomas Alexander preached, and Mr. Bankhead gave the charge."

However Mr. Montgomery may have performed his duty towards the congregation of which he thus got charge, he appears, for some time after his ordination, to have been rather negligent in the performance of his duty towards the Presbytery of which he became a member. In the minutes of that reverend body there is about this time more than one entry enjoining different ministers "to write to Mr. Alex. Montgomery relative to his so frequently disappointing the Presbytery when appointed to preach, and also respecting his non-attendance at Presbytery, and to furnish him with his account of fines for absence." These fines he is stated to have invariably paid; and I must add that, considering the remoteness of Mr. Montgomery's residence from the places where the Presbytery generally met, as well as the smallness of his salary as assistant minister of Glenarm, I think his co-presbyters might have been contented with something less than the infliction of a pecuniary penalty upon their scantily-endowed brother for his neglect of presbyterial duty.

From this time until the Remonstrant separation in 1829, all the information that we have in the Presbyterial records relative to the congregation with which we are now concerned is contained in rough Minutes of Visitation Presbyteries, which, in the interval, were held at Glenarm. Of these minutes the following is an abstract:—

August, 1805.—At a Visitation held this day, at Glenarm, Mr. Montgomery expressed himself satisfied with the conduct of the congregation, and stated that they attended public worship "as well as could be expected, and, in general, waited for the blessing." Commissioners from the Session and Congregation concurred in giving an equally favourable report of "Mr. Montgomery's conduct and doctrine," as well as of the discharge by each other of their own respective duties. A settled account was produced, which showed a yearly stipend payable to

* This was exactly the sum which the congregation of Glenarm was set down as paying to its minister (Mr. Acheson) in the return which was furnished to the Government by Dr. Black, of Derry, in 1799.—*(See Castlereagh Correspondence*, iii. 167*)*.

Mr. Montgomery of £44 16s. 7d.; on which, however, there had accrued, up to the date of visitation, an arrear of £65 3s. 5d. It was ordered that the Presbytery should hold its next meeting at Glenarm, in the month of October, and that, in the meantime, Mr. Montgomery should exchange pulpits with Mr. Thomson, of Larne, who was to explain to the Congregation of Glenarm the sentiments of the Presbytery respecting the very great arrear due by them to their Minister. All this was done, but apparently with very little effect; for, at the meeting in October, "Mr. Montgomery being asked whether the sum due at the last meeting was in any considerable degree reduced, answered in the negative;" whereupon the Presbytery recommended it to the Glenarm Congregation "to choose a new Committee, who should be instructed to use such measures for enforcing payment as to them might seem most expedient, and to make a report of the same to next meeting." Of the efficacy of the measures (if any) which were taken by the new Committee towards reducing the arrears of stipend due to Mr. Montgomery we cannot now judge, for no record or report on the subject appears in the Minutes of Presbytery.

May 5, 1812, was the date of the next Visitation of Glenarm, when the Session was represented by John Read and Alexander M'Cloy, and the Congregation by John and William Gibson, as Commissioners. On this occasion, "Mr. Montgomery being asked if he was satisfied with the conduct of the Congregation, answered he, in general, was, but complained of their attendance on public worship." Both classes of Commissioners expressed their "perfect satisfaction with Mr. Montgomery's conduct;" but a settled account which was produced, attested by Mr. Montgomery and Robert M'Kee, exhibited an arrear of stipend due to the former at May, 1812, amounting to £76. For the purpose of liquidating this very great arrear, a Committee, consisting of Messrs. Robert M'Kee, James Wilson, and John Gibson, was appointed, with instructions to report to Presbytery at its next meeting. But here, as in the previous instance, no report appears.

August 4, 1818.—At a Visitation of Glenarm, held this day, appeared Mr. Hunter, as Commissioner from the

Session, and Messrs. William M'Cloy and Archibald Crawford, as Commissioners from the Congregation, all of whom concurred in expressing their entire "satisfaction with the conduct of Mr. Montgomery, as a member of society and a Minister of the Gospel." The Commissioners from the Congregation, however, "being asked how the Session conducted themselves, they approved of them also, but regretted that they did not attend so regularly as they could wish." The Minister, being appealed to, also "regretted the want of attendance on the part of his Session. He expressed his approbation of the Congregation." The settled account, which was produced, signed by Mr. Montgomery and Mr. William Gibson, a member of Committee, showed a sum of £48 16s. 3d. due to the former at November, 1817. "The Presbytery lamented that such arrear had occurred, particularly after the late accommodating measures acceded to by Mr. Montgomery, and enjoined the Committee forthwith to adopt such means as to them might appear most effectual for liquidating the debt." What the "accommodating measures" were which had been acceded to by Mr. Montgomery I cannot now say. I suppose he had made a virtue of necessity, and forgiven some of the previous arrears.

The record of the next Visitation which was held at Glenarm is in the hand-writing of the late Rev. Robert Campbell, of Templepatrick, who was then Clerk of Presbytery. Its concise completeness is so characteristic of the admirable style of my old friend in such documents, and the information which it gives respecting the state of the Congregation at that time is so precise, that, although my space is limited, I am tempted to give it here unabridged.

"*Glenarm, May* 9, 1826.—Appeared Commissioners from the Session, David Morrow and Archibald Crawford; from the Congregation, James Acheson and James Lowry. Commissioners from Session, on being questioned, expressed their satisfaction with Mr. Montgomery as a Minister of the Gospel of Christ, and as a member of society. He visits the Congregation frequently from house to house; holds examinations in the several families when he visits them; visits the sick when called, and attends to the education of the young in the Congregation. The usual services in the meeting-house are, two sermons in Summer and one in Winter. The Congregation pay respect to the rules and discipline of the Session,

which consists of six members. The Congregation generally attend well. Attendance depends somewhat on the goodness or badness of the weather. The Lord's Supper is celebrated twice in the year: there are three tables in Summer, and two in Winter. Commissioners from Congregation gave similar answers concerning their Minister. They approved, also, of the conduct of the Session; believe that the Session distribute the weekly contributions faithfully, and agreeably to the intention of the people. Mr. Montgomery, being called in, expressed himself satisfied with the people in general, and also with the Session. The Congregational attendance depends considerably on the state of the weather. They come in regularly, considering their distance from the place of worship; pay due respect, and attend during the entire of Divine Service. Arrear of stipend, November 1, 1825, £30 14s. 2d. The Committee know the people on whom to call for this money, and think they will lose very little of it. Have no doubt they will get £25 of it."

I may here mention, on the authority of my worthy friend, Mr. John Gibson, of Unchenaugh, that about this time, viz., in August, 1825, a subscription was entered into for the repair of the Glenarm Meeting-house and the erection of the present Session-house connected therewith. At the head of the list of subscribers appeared the names of the late Sir Francis Macnaghten, and his son, the present Sir Edmund Macnaghten, for the joint sum of £15. Rev. Patrick O'Neill, who was then the parish priest of Glenarm, also contributed £1. The entire amount subscribed was about £30.

A few years after these occurrences, viz., on November 3, 1829, took place in Ballynure the meeting of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, at which the five Remonstrant members of that Body withdrew from the above-named ecclesiastical connexion, and also from the General Synod of Ulster. On this occasion, Mr. Montgomery, of Glenarm, who was not accompanied by any elder, manfully cast in his lot with his Remonstrant brethren; but he is not reported to have taken any active part in that day's eventful proceedings. The secession of Mr. Montgomery from the General Synod, was followed, in his case, as it was in the great majority of such cases, by a split in his congregation. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there adhered, on this occasion, to Mr. Montgomery's ministry, 101 seatholders, paying an annual stipend of £18 5s. 7d., whilst 50 seatholders, paying an annual stipend of £7 6s. 4d., withdrew from his pastoral charge

and founded the new congregation in Glenarm, of which Rev. Hugh Waddell was the first, and is the present minister.*

In 1836 Mr. Montgomery, having then been 35 years minister of Glenarm, retired from the active duties of his office and took an assistant and successor. He survived until April 1, 1853, when he departed this life, and was interred in his own Meeting-house green, where a

* The rupture in the Glenarm Congregation, at this time, was not accompanied with the violence of conduct or bitterness of feeling which attended a similar proceeding, at the same period, in the neighbouring Congregation of Cairncastle. The persons who, on different occasions, appeared at meetings of the Synodical Presbytery of Templepatrick, as Commissioners from the discontented portion of Mr. Montgomery's congregation, were, James Acheson, Thomas M'Mullan, and Robert M'Kay. The joint meeting of the Presbyteries of Templepatrick and Ballymena, at which the new Congregation of Glenarm was taken into connexion, was held at Glenarm on December 29, 1829, "in the open air, in consequence of Mr Montgomery refusing the use of the Meeting-house." The local magistrate, Mr. Thomas Davison, had previously declined giving the use of the Glenarm Courthouse "to preach in, as a temporary accommodation for the orthodox portion of the congregation;" and strong terms of condemnation were, at the same time, applied by the partizans of the General Synod to the alleged conduct of Mr. M'Kibbin, of Glenarm, who was the agent of Sir Francis Macnaghten, and who, according to Dr Stewart, of Broughshane, "had threatened the orthodox party with the loss of their farms should they desert Mr Montgomery's ministry." The truth of this allegation Mr. M'Kibbin denied. On May 12, 1830, the Presbytery of Templepatrick requested the Presbytery of Ballymena to take charge of the new Congregation of Glenarm. This request was acceded to by the Ballymena Presbytery, who shortly afterwards "planted" the society with a minister, and the congregation continues under the charge of the same reverend Body to the present day. In connexion with these proceedings in Glenarm, I may mention an anecdote which I heard when I came to this neighbourhood, a few years after the occurrences above described, but for the truth of which I do not vouch, although, from the character of the gentleman principally concerned, it is very likely to have been true. It is stated, that Mr. Montgomery having heard that on a certain Sunday the malcontent members of his congregation intended to take possession of the pulpit so soon as he left it, and also of the Meeting-house, took up with him into the pulpit his entire stock of sermons, and declared that he would go on preaching them one after another so long as they existed, and would then preach them over again as often as was necessary, rather than vacate his post to the people who so eagerly coveted its occupation. What length of time the performance even of the first part of this singular achievement would have occupied, my informants did not venture to surmise. But, fortunately, Mr. Montgomery was not required to put his threat in execution, for his opponents, seeing his determination, and knowing the man they had to deal with, wisely retired from the Meeting-house before their old minister had gone even once over his stock of sermons.

plain but neat monument, bearing the following inscription, was lately erected to his memory and that of his beloved wife, who also sleeps beneath :—

"Here lie the mortal remains of Rev. Alexander Montgomery, M.A., who departed this life on the 1st day of April, A.D., 1853, in the 88th year of his Age and 52nd year of his ministry in the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm. This stone is dedicated by a few of Mr. Montgomery's surviving hearers and friends to the memory of a faithful counsellor, a beloved companion, and an honest man.—Requiescat in pace."

"Here lie also the mortal remains of Elizabeth Dunn, the beloved wife of Rev. A. Montgomery, who died on the 4th day of December, 1848, in the 72nd year of her age."*

(*To be continued.*)

THE NAME GIVEN AT ANTIOCH.

(*Concluded from page 353.*)

If I have succeeded in carrying my readers' judgments with me thus far, we are now prepared to consider the justifiableness of the offence which is sometimes taken by persons who disown all subjection to Christ as an authoritative teacher, when they are told that they cannot be recognized as Christians, or as qualified for the office of teachers in the Christian Church; and of the outcry which is raised by others, who, though not professing to hold the same views with these men, take up the cudgels on their behalf, as if they were treated with injustice

* Mr. Montgomery married Elizabeth Dunn, of Glenarm, by whom he had three sons and five daughters, most of whom are either dead or in America. During his ministry at Glenarm he resided successively at Shanagh on the Harphall Estate; at the Curragh—in the same neighbourhood; at the village of Cairnlough, where he occupied the house which is now occupied by his son-in-law, Mr Gibbons; and finally in the town of Glenarm, where he died. After the death of his wife, and in order to be near his old friend, Mr. Glendy, he also lived for a short time at Ballycarry, in what is called "the Independent Row," and never was an Independent house more worthily occupied. The unbending spirit and manliness which, under the most trying circumstances, and in spite of the most adverse worldly fortune, he always exhibited, were most creditable to my venerable friend and neighbour. Nothing could teach *him* servility. He was passionately fond of field sports, particularly coursing, which in his earlier days was almost a regular clerical accomplishment; but, to appease the indignation thereat of our present stricter age, I may add that Mr. Montgomery was also a man of decidedly literary tastes and of very considerable classical attainments.

when the name of Christian is withheld from them. I think it can be easily shown that there is no just ground of offence in this case, nor any reason for the outcry.

To be a Christian is, as we have seen, the same as to be *a disciple*—that is, a pupil and follower of Christ—indicating that Jesus Christ is taken as a teacher whom the pupil believes, and a guide whom he would gladly follow. This deference Christ undoubtedly demanded. This is what is meant in the New Testament when we are called upon to "believe," or, more fully, "to believe in Christ Jesus." This faith was required of the early candidates for baptism, and all who sought admission into the Church; this is the faith which they who were called to the ministry of the Word were to propagate and spread among mankind. This faith it was that made them disciples, what would now be called *Christians*. To justify us in regarding men as Christians at the present day we ask no more, but we dare not accept of less. Further than this we have no wish to go, but short of this we are unable to stop. If any man, in the free exercise of his private judgment—which we have no desire to limit or restrain—comes to the conclusion either that Christ did not exist at all, or that he was a deceiver and impostor, or that he was a hot-brained fanatic who mistook the phantoms of his own imagination for a divine call, or that he was simply a good young man, who taught some useful truths, but who possessed no higher commission and authority than any of the other carpenters in the workshops of Nazareth, or any one of the fishermen on the Lake of Galilee, he is not a disciple of Jesus, and consequently not a Christian; and I cannot conceive why he should wish to take, or why he should wish me to give him, a name borrowed from that of a teacher whose claims he avowedly rejects.

I am told, indeed, that every good man is a Christian; every honest inquirer, every sincere professor of every creed, whatsoever be its tenets or its precepts! But just consider for a moment what that means. It means that a *Christian* (that is, a disciple of Christ) means *a disciple of Moses*, or a *disciple of Mahomet*, or a *disciple of Buddha*, or a *disciple of Sakya-mouni!* It means that a good and true Mussulman is a real Christian; it means that a

sincere believer in Juggernauth is a real Christian; it means that every one who believes in the Book of Mormon and the prophet Joseph Smith, and who zealously practises the peculiar precepts of that very peculiar form of faith, is, notwithstanding all this, or rather on this very account, a good and true Christian. It is to say that every sincere Atheist, though he rejects every doctrine that Christ inculcated,—though he denies that the world ever had a Creator, or that it is superintended by any providence,—though he denies the immortality of the soul, and believes that the only distinction between right and wrong is that which is made by human custom—is to be received and acknowledged as a good Christian! Is it possible for the force of absurdity to go further? Yes: there are men who believe with M. Renan that Jesus was a juggler; that, in concert with Lazarus and his sisters, he contrived and executed the artful scene of a mock resurrection at Bethany. And these men pretend to be greatly hurt if they are not accepted as Christians, that is, disciples of him whom they denounce as an impostor and a cheat! And there are numbers who conceive that those who scruple to send out such persons to preach the Gospel are bigots, and inquisitors, and persecutors, and what not? What right has such a man to be offended at being refused a designation which does not describe his stand-point? He has no more right to be called a Christian than he has to be called a Hindoo, and no more reason to be hurt because he is refused the one name than he would have if denied the other. Recollect I do not say that such a person is not a good man, an honest man, a worthy man. He may be a very good, honest, and worthy man. He may be a much better, more honest, more worthy man than many believers in Christ—a far better and more worthy man than I am myself. But that is not the question. Many Jews are very good men; many Mussulmen are very good men; many Hindoos are very good men; many Deists are very good men; many Buddhists are very good men. It is not of their goodness we are speaking. There are in all these forms of faith some men who are far superior to the generality of Christians. I am sorry to have to say this, in one point of view, for it is not to

the credit of the Christian world; but in another point of view I say it with pleasure, for I am pleased to acknowledge the existence of goodness wherever I find it. But it is not a question of goodness or badness, but of a very different thing—a mere matter of fact—namely, Are these men Christians by persuasion and belief? I acknowledge that there are many excellent and virtuous Jews, Mussulmen, Hindoos, Buddhists, Deists, Atheists. But are they, on that account, Christians? To ask the question is to answer it.

On the ground of reason and common sense, no less than on the ground of Scripture, it is evident that there is a certain faith which unites all Christians,—a faith which makes them Christians,—a faith without which men, however wise and excellent, are not Christians; and that is faith in Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of God, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, —who is the brightness of his glory and the express image of his substance,—the Author and Finisher of the faith.—the power of God and the wisdom of God." Nor does the New Testament, from which I have borrowed these expressions, use them in a vague, vapid, and vaporous sense, such as would make them applicable to all men who are good and true. They are there used in a sense which is peculiar to the Saviour, and superior to that in which they could possibly be applied to any other person; one that gives to Christ a strictly divine mission, supernatural power, and authority as a guide of faith. In the Bible there is mention of many good men, but only of one Christ. So much as this in clear and settled faith is, if I can read the New Testament, essential to the name of Christian. To make a man a *good* Christian much more is requisite. But I am not speaking of the character of a Christian at present; I am only speaking of the name, a matter of far less importance in my opinion, but of so much importance in the eyes of some that they insist on claiming and using it without the shadow of a title. Were it not for this preposterous claim of theirs I should hardly have dwelt so long on this subject.

And as I protest against the conduct of those who would empty the holy and venerable name of Christian of all

definite meaning, so do I lift my voice to deprecate the action of others who would infuse into it a special signification which the term does not import, and which no usage of Scripture warrants. Men, but more especially theologians, have not been content at all times—indeed, they have very seldom been content—to let the sacred Scriptures speak for themselves;—they have not been satisfied to let John, or Paul, or Jesus speak in his own words;—they vastly prefer to make them speak in their own pet phrases and familiar idiom. They have drawn out a number of inferences and articles to which they require their fellow-Christians to assent under the penalty of being excluded from the Christian Church and all its benefits. Hence, though a man may firmly believe and consistently profess his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and his divine authority, they will shut him out from the pale of Christianity if he cannot creep in through the little narrow door of entrance which they have opened for themselves and their adherents. For example, there are many who tell us that unless we have been baptized by a clergyman deriving his ordination by the imposition of episcopal hands, which have had their wonder-working virtue handed down in regular succession from the Apostles, we are no Christians! Who told them this, I wonder? Vast multitudes assure us solemnly that unless we believe the doctrines of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds we are no Christians! Where, I should like to know, does the Bible say a word about the Nicene or Athanasian creeds, or the necessity of believing them? And so, according to some, we must assent to the decrees of Trent—with others we must believe in the Thirty-nine Articles—with others, again, we must profess a hearty faith in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms—with others we must adopt the doctrines laid down in the voluminous writings of Mr. Wesley. Now, Mr. Wesley was a worthy and excellent Christian himself—a burning and a shining light. I find much good in his writings, and I am willing to embrace all the good I can find there, or anywhere; but he is no rule of faith to me, nor I hope to my readers. I am sure he would himself have disclaimed the thought of setting up his own opinions as a standard of doctrine for any one; but whether he did or not, I disclaim all subjection to is

authority in matters of faith. And so likewise with regard to the divines of Westminster—the fathers of the Church of England—and the prelates assembled at Trent. I find some things that are true, and some things that are useful in all of them. But Christ has not required me to bow the knee to any such body of men. The Christian name does not imply subjection to any such convocation. To be a disciple of Christ implies subjection to HIM, and not only does not require, but absolutely forbids, the adoption of other leaders or the recognition of their decrees as an authoritative standard of belief, worship, or duty.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN.

A SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSON.—No. 8.

THE parables of our Lord are very simple, yet exceedingly impressive. They are easily understood; still they contain the most important truths, whilst by their liveliness and the aptness of their illustration they at once make way to our hearts, and we feel, as well as understand, their truth. I am persuaded that all to whom I now speak—all, I mean, who are able to read and to comprehend—know the parable of the Good Samaritan. It is one of the loveliest of stories—a perfect picture in itself; for as we read we fancy we see the road to Jericho—the poor, wounded traveller—the priest and the Levite passing him by, and then the despised Samaritan stopping, pitying, and relieving, and taking the man on his own ass to the inn. Jesus spake this parable to the teacher of the law, who had put to him an ensnaring question—What he should do to inherit eternal life? Our Saviour, who always dealt prudently, answered him with the highest wisdom in referring him to the divine law, which the teacher must own as such. He replies that the first commandment was to love God; the second, to love his neighbour as himself. The reply was quite right. All that was further required was to obey the commandment. But the teacher, willing, perhaps, yet to puzzle, proceeds to ask Jesus who his neighbour was, and our Lord replies to him in the beautiful parable before us, in order to make this man ashamed of his craft and narrow-mindedness, and to cause him,

also, to see that one of another nation, if he feared God and showed mercy to his brother in distress, would be accepted at the last great day.

"Jerusalem and Jericho."—Jerusalem was, we all know, the chief city of the Holy Land—the pride of the Jewish people, and called by them the "Joy of the whole Earth." Jericho, or the City of Palms, was a large and fine town, nearly fourteen miles from Jerusalem, and nearer to the river Jordan. Jericho was the first place taken by the Israelites after they entered the promised land. Its walls fell flat down at the blowing of the trumpets. The road between these places lay for a great part between high rocks, and in the hollows of these rocks robbers hid themselves to waylay and plunder, and often to kill, defenceless passengers. This road is still very unsafe to travel. An English gentleman, with his servants, was, not many years since, attacked and robbed here. It bears the name, even now, of the Bloody Way. We see then how the "man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho fell among thieves." His case must have been very pitiable, for these robbers took from him all his clothes, as well as his money, and they likewise shockingly ill-used him.

Whilst lying in this deplorable state, we are told a priest came that way. It should be said, that many priests lived at Jericho, so that it had the name of the city of priests, and as they all in their turns ministered at the temple of Jerusalem, we cannot wonder at their continually passing to and fro through the road between that city and Jericho. Well, we may suppose the priest went tremblingly forward. The place was dangerous and he was alone. He sees the poor suffering man groaning with anguish and unable to lift up himself. Why does he not stop and help him? Doubtless he was afraid, and so he cautiously passes on the other side. We are not to imagine that this priest was void of feeling, very probably he felt deeply for the wounded traveller; but he felt more for himself; for his own safety and selfishness whispered to him to make haste or he might be overtaken and suffer the same fate. Most certainly he did not act becomingly; he ought to have run the risk. Still we must not too severely blame him—we

must think of his own unprotected state, and the alarm he would naturally feel; and, whilst we cannot justify, we may in some measure excuse, his unconcern.

But a Levite also draws near. The Levites attended on the priests, and, therefore, where the priests were found the Levites also had their residence. Now, this Levite not only sees the poor man, but he comes near to him, and stops, and looks at him, compassionates his case, and yet does nothing for him. By his stopping we may suppose that he was not so greatly alarmed as the priest had been. He was of a bolder and more determined character, yet he passes on;—he cannot afford to stop;—he would help if he knew how, but time pressed; and whilst he was about an act of mercy the robbers might assail him, and he should be sacrificed, with little good to the wounded traveller. So he, like the priest, consults his own safety alone, and pursues his solitary journey, perhaps with misgivings of mind, with reproaches of conscience, yet afraid to linger on a spot where so much mischief had already been done. We must not forget that the traveller, the priest, and the Levite were all Jews, fellow-countrymen, and bound by the dearest ties to assist each other; and to this point our Lord's story tends.

The unfortunate Jew was passed by unhelped by his two countrymen, whilst another person, who now appears on the scene—not a Jew, but a Samaritan—one of a nation despised and hated by the Jews even more than they despised and hated the heathens—yet stops and looks at the fallen man, does not pass him by, nor hurry away from the dangerous neighbourhood, but remains by him—has compassion on him, and shows it in the most effectual manner. He thinks not of the robbers nor of his own safety. His thought is only for the poor object before him;—he gently raises him, applies balm to his wounds, pours wine down his throat to revive and strengthen, and then cautiously sets him on his own beast, leading him slowly to the inn, that there he may enjoy that care and repose he so greatly needed. Nor does the good Samaritan stop, as many would have done, here. He knew that more yet was required for health and comfort. So he leaves money with the host for the immediate wants of his charge,

giving also directions that he should want for nothing requisite. "Take care of him, and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again I will repay thee."

And now Jesus, having brought the narrative to a conclusion, asks the lawyer, "Which now of these three thinkest thou was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?" Which, my young friends, do you think? But I need not ask, you will tell me, with one voice, the Samaritan, and you will not scruple to *call* him the Samaritan; and yet you see that the Jewish teacher hesitates to do so. He cannot bring himself to utter the name, to him most odious. He replies, "He that showed mercy?" Mark the "he." Still, he was forced to own that the Samaritan had done to a Jew what Jews had been too cowardly or too unwilling to do. The Samaritan was the neighbour, for he acted to the life the neighbour's part, and thus was the lawyer convicted out of his own mouth, doubtless to his great surprise and mortification, whilst to us the lesson is of the highest importance. Who is *our* neighbour? Why, every one with whom we have to do—every one who stands in need of our kindness and care. We all are neighbours to each other, and we all should try to do our neighbours good. Your teachers consider you as their neighbours, and they do a neighbourly act in coming to instruct you in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and your duty to God and man; and you must be neighbours to your school-fellows and friends, by being kind to them, by helping them, by setting to the younger scholars a good example. Be neighbours to the blind, and the lame, and the weak, by giving them what aid they require. Be neighbours to all by shewing love to all.

B.

REVIEW.

Six Essays on Inspiration, Revealed Religion, and Miracles. By Edward Higginson, Author of "*The Spirit of the Bible.*" London: Whitfield, Green, & Son. 1866. 84 pp., 12mo.

We have all along maintained that notwithstanding the noise and bluster of those who would wish to be con-

sidered as the "Men of Progress" in the English Unitarian churches, there are not a few—and these men of distinguished learning, ability, and character,—who are not prepared to give up faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Divine Revelation contained in the Bible; and who upon just occasion would come forward to defend and recommend to the attention of their brethren the principles which they conscientiously hold. From time to time we perceive indications that we were right in so maintaining: and among them we place the appearance of the Six Essays by Mr. Higginson, the title of which we have placed at the head of this article. The subject of these Essays is judiciously chosen; the matter is handled with great ability, earnestness, and candour; and the publication is opportune. Mr. Higginson states, in the following terms, the circumstance which induced him to take up his pen:—

"Recent discussions in England on Miracles, Inspiration, and Divine Revelation, appear to the writer of these Essays to have been conducted somewhat unfairly on the negative side of the argument. Many who hold that side persist in representing the assertion of the miraculous in Christianity as equivalent to a denial of Divine Providence in everything else—the assertion of occasional supernatural inspiration as the denial of God's natural and constant access to the human soul—and the belief in a special divine revelation as a disbelief in the ever living God. Surely they are fighting with imaginary opponents, or strangely burlesquing their real ones! The latter wondered at first what all this strange talk meant, and were naturally indignant when they found themselves to be the subjects of the irreverent burlesque. It is one of the unfairest arts of controversy to state your opponent's opinions for him, instead of letting him do it himself.

"In the following Essays I endeavour simply to state afresh the real beliefs which are understood to be thus caricatured. I express my own deliberate and mature opinions on these important subjects; and perhaps also the general belief of those who hold the positive side on the questions at issue. Certainly it is not the belief commonly imputed by those who are called 'advanced theologians' to such of us as 'stand upon the older tracks.'

"I might easily have culled, from the writers of forty and fifty years ago, and still further back, a sufficient number of extracts to vindicate my own statements by their high sanction. But it would have seemed somewhat degrading to set about proving thus inductively that those great defenders of Revelation, Miracle, and special Inspiration — Samuel Clarke, Locke, Butler, Paley, Priestley, Whately, and the rest—really believed in the *living* God, in Providence *always active*, and in the *perpetual access* of the Heavenly Father to his children's souls. These vital Theistic beliefs were implied in

their historical convictions in favour of Divine Revelation, and again confirmed by their Christian convictions.

"To those who are most likely to read these pages it may be well that I should refer more pointedly to Dr. Priestley's sermon *on Habitual Devotion;* to Mrs. Barbauld's *Hymn to the Deity*, which was suggested by reading that sermon, and to the late Dr. Carpenter's essay on *Divine Influences*. Of such writers as these it is now insinuated that they thought the God of their belief and worship to have only 'lived' in the past tense; or to be, like Baal, on a journey, or peradventure asleep! I am ashamed for their calumniators. The older theological position was that of believing in *both* natural and revealed religion, which some are still simple enough to regard as harmonious volumes of the Divine perfections and will. In these Essays I virtually re-state that position, which it is the fashion of the day to evade or becloud, if not directly to deny."

Mr. Higginson states that he and his fellow-believers "wondered at first what all this strange talk meant:" and if they considered the facts of the case alone, they had a right to wonder. How could it appear otherwise than wonderful, and ground of indignation too, that they whose whole mind and thought were imbued with the conviction of the continual influence of an ever-present God upon the hearts that are duly prepared as a dwelling-place for his holy spirit,—whose every discourse was tinctured with the same belief, often resting upon it as a foundation, always assuming it as a fact,—whose every prayer in public and in private was modelled upon the belief that the Deity has at all times access to the souls of his children, and that he will and does continually aid their holy impulses and virtuous struggles by the help of his divine grace,—should be represented as denying the principles which enter into the very essence of their faith! But if the quarter whence this gross misrepresentation proceeded had been taken into account, surprise would have been mitigated, though indignation might not be appeased.

If we were to analyse this little volume, and illustrate our critique by extracting the passages which we deem worthy of especial note, our remarks would extend to a length inconsistent with our limits, and disproportioned to the size of the work to which they would relate. We, therefore content ourselves with referring our readers to the Essays themselves; and we are much mistaken if they will not rise from the perusal with a hearty approbation of the main sentiments advocated in their pages. The

only sentence with which we would be inclined to find fault is that in p. 75:—"Probably those who professed them," [supernatural gifts], "could not exactly have distinguished between the natural operations of their own powers and the special help added." That enthusiasts should not be able to distinguish between their fancied spiritual endowments and the natural promptings of their own minds, is what we might well expect; but that the Almighty should miraculously communicate supernatural gifts to the mind of his servant, and then leave that servant in doubt whether any such endowment had been received, seems to us a gratuitous and quite inadmissible hypothesis.

A learned correspondent informs us that "Mrs. Barbauld's Hymn [*Address*] to the Deity was suggested, not by *reading*, but by *hearing*, Dr. Priestley's sermon on Habitual Devotion, as originally delivered before an assemblage of ministers at Wakefield, in Yorkshire, in the year 1767;" and refers to *Priestley's Works*, by Rutt, vol. xv. p. 101, which completely bears him out in his statement. The matter is chiefly important, as it shows the early development of that gifted lady's poetical powers. In 1767 Mrs. Barbauld (then Miss Aikin) was only twenty-four years of age. The sermon was not published till 1782, at which time she was thirty-nine.

We observe that a carping, snarling, and most uncandid critique on these Essays has appeared in the pages of the London *Inquirer*. This was to be expected. Mr. Higginson could scarcely have looked for fair play in that quarter. He will probably agree with us in accepting the abuse of that periodical,—or its editor,—as a compliment. But if he feels in any degree hurt by the malignant onslaught, let him be assured that he has the sympathy, approbation, and gratitude of thousands, to whom the Gospel is dear and the Saviour precious; and, unquestionably, the esteem of such persons will compensate for the contempt cast upon him by the insidious enemies of both.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

It surprises none who pay attention to the proceedings of our "advanced" Unitarians, that articles appear in the periodical which especially adopts their views, intended to elevate Philosophy at the expense of Christianity. Such an article, under the heading I have repeated above, came under my notice a few weeks back. (Need I note, *par parenthese*, that the periodical in question distinguishes itself by the name of *The Inquirer!* It informed its readers, in that article, that they might "observe something curious, if not edifying"—not edifying, certainly—in "discovering how much there is, in New Testament Christianity, toned and coloured by the Alexandrian Philosophy." Not so much, perhaps, however, even allowing John and Paul to have been, in a sense, philosophers. We are further told that "much of that pure influence which most of the Orthodox Trinitarian sects are wont to attribute wholly to the special and miraculous agency of Christ, may have had a natural beginning in the mind and work of such men as Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Plato." Indeed, it *would* be "curious, if not edifying," were the teachings of Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Plato placed in juxtaposition with those of Jesus, in order that we might see the likeness. But I do not expect anyone, even though an *advanced* Unitarian, to undertake that task. The "mind and work" of Christ were so perfectly those of the individual who breathed that mind into precepts and doctrine, and who wrought that work by the confessed agency of the Almighty, that any attempt at parallelism between him and the most illustrious sages of heathen antiquity becomes too absurd to be seriously contemplated. As Milman wrote, in his "History of Christianity," "Christ was as much beyond his age,"—though, be it noted, nearly all the masterpieces of Greek and Roman philosophy were then extant,—"as his age was beyond the darkest barbarism." And yet the teachings of Jesus were wholly without a philosophic tinge; all distinctively didactic, no approach to the speculative to be found in them, which was one reason, no doubt, why "the common people heard him gladly;" while in this *ascent* of the new religion from "the common people" to their superiors in rank and education, instead of its *descent* from their superiors to them, we have another proof that at its origin it had no philosophical ingredients. Jesus himself was an uneducated artisan. His detractors asked, "How knoweth this man letters, never having learned?" And how, then, *we* may ask, could he have obtained any acquaintance with the "mind" of Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Plato? And allowing, as I have said, John and Paul to have been, in their way, and as compared with the other apostles, philosophers, we may easily see that Christianity, pure Christianity, the simple Christianity of Christ, gained nothing from that circumstance. But for his philosophical dealing with an already well-known term, "The Word," by John, the mainstay of the doctrine of the Trinity, to the conceptions of the modern orthodox, would not have existed; and if Paul had not philosophised, rather than spoken in the spirit of his Master, in some of his epistles, the monstrous doctrines of

Election and Reprobation, as promulgated by Augustine and by Calvin, had never burdened Christans with the task of vainly seeking to reconcile such doctrines with the dictates of reason and the language of Jesus.

Again, all the plain corrupters of the simplicity of Christian doctrine, from Simon Magus, mentioned in the New Testament, to the Arius and Athanasius of the time of Constantine,—Cerinthus, Saturninus, Basilides, Valentinus, Bardesanes, Marcion, Paul of Samosata,—all were, or at the least affected to be philosophers. *All*, more or less, exemplified the "philosophy and vain deceit" spoken of by the apostle, when writing, in some of his best moments, to the infant church at Colosse. "Beware," said he (agreeably to a better rendering than that of our authorised translators), "beware lest any man make spoil of you through an empty and deceitful philosophy, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ." "The same apostle," as orthodox Cruden, to my thinking, was not far from right in telling us, "opposes, in many of his epistles, the false wisdom of the age, which was nothing else but the Pagan philosophy, always contrary to the wisdom of Christ and the true religion." And would to God there were none of this "false wisdom" in the philosophic dreams of some of this present age, who, calling themselves Christians, and vaunting their peculiar freedom as such, place side by side with the Sermon on the Mount what an American contemporary, Dr. Pellows, so well denominates "the vanities of transcendental philosophy," admiring, as they say, the "noble efforts" of the early Greek thinkers "to find thought behind phenomena, spirit behind matter, permanence behind change," &c. Yes, it is ever the labour of the transcendentalist to find something *behind* what the eye of common sense can recognise; something *beyond* what can be arrived at by induction from the seen and the known; something in the region of pure ideality, that with him is greater than all the teachings of experience, and than every testimony to facts, however well authenticated, whether popular or scientific, sacred or profane. Nay, he can "feel after and find" God, who plainly reveals himself by his works to their simple student, only by first convincing himself that God and his own thinking faculty are in nature one and the same; wherefore, as he is sure of the existence of his thinking faculty, he publishes his philosophical allowance to the world that there *is* a God. The Saviour said of the "pure in heart" that they should "see God," thus placing communion with the Infinite Father on a moral basis; the Transcendentalist places it on a metaphysical one. And to what is all this leading us? "Whither are we Tending?" as I ventured to ask in a recent tract. The organ of *advancement* already spoken of candidly tells us that it cares little if it be to "some sort of Theism, or even Pantheism." "What then?" it asks. "Are we to be frightened with ugly-looking words? Suppose Theism, or even Pantheism, should happen to be the truth." Well, for my part, I am not philosophical enough to entertain the supposition. I am a "*Christian* Unitarian;" and as I have confidence that *Christian* Unitarianism is by essence "the truth as it is in Jesus," I have no fears that it will ever be "outgrown," as

the organ thinks it "quite possible" that *its* Unitarianism may be. Perhaps the sooner *that* consummation arrives the better.

T. C.

INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE.

The first annual conference of the Unitarian Churches of America met at Syracuse, N.Y., on Tuesday evening, October 9. A large number of delegates, both clerical and lay, from all parts of the country, were present. The introductory services were conducted by the Rev. Dr. Hedge, who preached a sermon marked by originality of thought and eloquence, from Rom. v. 11: "We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." After the discourse and prayer, the congregation united in singing the Missionary Hymn with great spirit. At the close of the service there was a half-hour of cordial greeting and hand-shaking by long-separated friends. On Wednesday morning, at half past eight o'clock, the church was filled with ministers, laymen, and ladies, to engage in morning devotions. The Rev. Dr. Hosmer conducted the service, reading appropriate selections of Scripture and offering a fervent and impressive prayer. He was followed by several other clergymen. At a quarter before ten the conference was called to order by the Rev. E. E. Hale, secretary, who asked ex-Governor Goodwin, of New Hampshire, to take the chair in the absence of the president, John A. Andrew. A committee to report a list of officers, and another to arrange the order of business, were appointed by the Chairman. While these committees were attending to their respective duties, Dr. Bellows, Chairman of the Council, read a report of the work of that body. The treasurer reported on the financial condition of the Conference. After the officers had been elected, the Hon. T. D. Elliott, of Massachusetts, being appointed president, the Rev. F. E. Abbott, of Dover, N.H., rose, and asked leave to present, at the proper time, an amendment on the preamble and first article of the Constitution of the Conference. It appeared that Mr. Abbott, and those whom he represented, objected to the terms, "the *Lord* Jesus Christ" and "the kingdom of *his Son*," as they occur in the following part of the preamble—"Whereas, the great opportunities and demands for Christian labour and consecration at this time increase our sense of the obligations of all disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ to prove their faith by self-denial and by the devotion of their lives and possessions to the service of God and the building up of the kingdom of his Son." They also objected to the first article, which restricted the Conference to "Churches of the Unitarian faith."

The President now took the chair, and congratulated the members upon the pleasant and cheering auspices under which they had met. The secretary reported that one hundred and seventy six churches and twelve missionary and other associations were represented in this session of the Conference. About 430 delegates were

present. On the motion of Dr. Hedge, it was agreed that the amendment in the constitution submitted by Mr. Abbott be taken up at the afternoon session, and be then discussed and settled. The Rev. J. H. Heywood, of Louisville, Ky., then presented a memorial from the Western Conference, setting forth the ideas and suggestions of that body on the questions of most pressing practical moment. It was followed by a report of the Rev. J. F. Clarke from the committee which the New York Convention "charged with the duty of promoting acquaintance, fraternity, and amity between ourselves and all our brethren of like liberal faith."

Mr. ABBOTT then rose to explain the grounds and intent of the amendment he had proposed. He did not propose to discuss the question on theological grounds. With the question, whether Jesus Christ is "Lord" in the sense in which that word is generally understood, he had nothing to do. The young men associated with him could not honestly accept that word with the meaning usually attached to it, and they appealed to the Conference to strike out the offending member in order that they might remain in the Conference and work with their older brethren. The preamble as it stands is regarded as a creed, at least as a creedlet. It contains a doctrine by implication, and a doctrine which we cannot subscribe to. We are willing to work with you; we want to work with you; but we cannot work with you on that platform without losing our self respect. This body is not a theological one. We protest against creeds. Can we not do away with even the appearance of a creed, and take our stand on the spirit? We appeal to, we implore you, to make this change, and thus allow us to remain and work with you. Rev. E. C. Towne, of Medford, followed with an earnest and urgent plea for the proposed preamble. He said, we come here as petitioners. We ask you to permit us to remain and work with you in the Conference, which we cannot do under the present preamble without a sacrifice of self-respect.

At the afternoon session Mr. Abbott's proposed amendment to the Constitution came up, and the discussion was opened by Rev. Dr. Hedge. He opposed Mr. Abbott's amendment on several grounds. It was necessary to have a distinct recognition of Christianity as a providential fact and force in history. The Christian Church rests upon faith in Christ. Other foundation can no man lay. The proposal of Mr. Clarke was quite as objectionable to him. Admit other Christian churches, and what is to hinder our losing ourselves in a heterogeneous mass? Many years ago in Massachusetts a fund was left to provide for preaching the Gospel to the "Indians and others." The Indians have faded out, but the trustees have no difficulty in making their disbursements; for "the others" remain. Adopt this amendment and the "others" may gain a preponderance in the Conference, and pervert it to their own ends.

C. C. BURLEIGH, who represented the society in Florence, Mass., replied to Dr. Hedge. He thought the Conference ought to admit all who were willing to work with them. If the work was great and good they ought to rejoice that others would help them to carry it on, whether they agree with you in theology or not. They ought to welcome others in order to help them and

make them better, as Christ mingled with publicans and sinners for their good. To say that the Unitarian body would be swallowed up by the others was a confession of weakness he was not prepared to hear.

Rev. Dr. BELLOWS could neither vote for the proposed change on the ground of expediency nor on the score of conviction. So long as the matter was left where it was, he did not care to call attention to and force discussion upon it. But now that a respectable, earnest, intelligent, highly-cultivated body of men come forward and ask a change, and put their plea on the solemn ground of conscience, declaring that their self-respect is involved in the issue, there is no other course left to us than to take up the question and settle it once and for ever. We cannot go on another step with our organization until this matter is set at rest. With all possible respect for the gentlemen who bring forward this amendment, they must not imagine that they have all the conscience of this Conference, or that their self-respect alone is involved in this issue. He felt deeply, seriously, far more solemnly than he knew how to express, the greatness of the truth that finds expression in the phrase which is objected to, and the tremendous responsibility that rests upon us to maintain that confession. The essence of the Christian religion is lodged in the phrase in question. And whatever imperils an acknowledgment of Christ's supremacy strikes a blow at all that is deepest, dearest, and divinest in human experience, and at the sources of the world's welfare and hope. Christianity rests upon the person of Christ. The growth and power of any church depends far less upon its polity than upon its position respecting that divine person whose coming marked an epoch in the world's history. Science has somewhat shaken public faith in this truth, but there is a fast-growing reaction from the cold impersonalities of scientific and philosophical thought to the kindling, comforting, and inspiring faith in a personal Redeemer. Young men may have wit and learning, but in grave matters like these shall we not rather rely on the judgment of those who have added long years of experience to their power of thought, and corrected their theories by actual contact with the world? Liberality also opposes the amendment. We are to consider not only the few on one side who may or may not care to unite with us, but the great body of Christians of all denominations, the Universal Church of Christ. He demanded liberality to them, the liberality which acknowledged their Lord and Leader, and welcomed them to a household whose hearth glowed with faith in and loyalty to the personal Saviour. If we change at all, it must be in the other direction. We are not so certain about the desirability of having others to join us. We have not yet shown skill enough in rowing our own boat to make it exactly safe to increase the crew, especially from a class even less skilful and experienced than we are, and if we take on too many hands all may go down together. Of course this Unitarian body is small in comparison with the size of other denominations and the church universal. So our houses are very puny affairs in comparison with the world. We don't set our homes up against boundless space, as though they could be com-

pared for a moment with the breadth and magnificence of the universe; but nevertheless we must have our four walls to fold in our heart's treasures and keep the sentiments and blessed domesticities of life healthy and warm. This Unitarian denomination is not so spacious as the church universal, but it contains what is dear and precious and to be protected; and if the standard of faith is lowered, as the amendment proposes, he should feel compelled to secede.

Rev. Mr. Mayo objected to the amendment because it took away a Leader and put nothing in his place. Our people want leaders, not abstractions. Platforms, resolutions, and theories go for nothing in the West. When the people wanted to save the Union they did not publish a proposition, but followed Grant and Sherman and the other great leaders of the national cause. He would be ashamed to go back and tell his people that all this Conference had done was to give up calling Jesus "Lord." People require personal leaders, and in the great march of progress and improvement in this Western world, in the terrible conflict with the vices and sins of this age, no less commanding and august a person than Jesus Christ will satisfy them. When mesmerism and clairvoyance appeared in New York and created a sensation, some young people called on Father Raynor, a venerable Universalist, and gave him a glowing account of what Andrew Jackson Davis had done. The old disciple heard them through, and said: "This may all be very well for you young folks, but as for me, I have followed Jesus Christ these seventy years, and I don't think it will pay for me to give him up even for Andrew Jackson Davis."

Mr. Abbott hereupon rose to correct what he feared, from the remarks of Dr. Bellows and Mr. Mayo, was a wrong impression. He did not ask any man to abandon his faith, or change his creed, if he had one. He and his young brothers asked the Conference to remove a serious objection and offence from the platform of the Conference. Individuals could and would believe just what they believe at present. We ask you to change this objectionable theological plank for one that is not theological, and that all can heartily agree to and unite upon. The true bond of unity is the Spirit. The only true and perfect union is unity of the spirit. We can have that. We all believe in Christian work and worship. We all believe in organization for worship and work. We all want to unite with you for these great objects. But we also believe in freedom of thought and the binding force of conviction. We cannot unite upon a creed; we can and shall gladly unite and work together harmoniously and effectively upon the broader and deeper ground of the spirit.

Rev. Charles Noyes, of Northfield, thought the difference could be harmonized by adding to the Constitution an article, or resolution, guaranteeing to each individual member perfect liberty of thought and freedom of interpretation.

Rev. G. W. Skinner, of Stoneham, opposed the amendment on various grounds. We cannot go before the country with a Christianity and no Christ in it. This is a point upon which the conscience of our people is peculiarly sensitive. The Universalist body, with which he was best acquainted, felt very deeply and keenly

upon this subject. Hundreds in that denomination look with interest upon this Conference, and if we strike Christ from the Constitution we shall disappoint their hopes and alienate their sympathies.

Rev. Dr. Osgood would give every honest thought a candid hearing, and had great respect for the mover of the amendment from which he was compelled to dissent. The present preamble is fair to the denomination. It is also comprehensive. Though its language is more agreeable to some than to others, all Christians can stand upon it, both to work and to worship. It contains no dogma, and leaves each individual free to determine the sense in which he will accept it. It is inclusive, not exclusive; merely affirming what the transcendental as well as the evangelical mind has always accepted. The great liberals of Europe, such as Schenkel and Martineau, can and do accept and use the same language in their own large, spiritual way; and if not exactly satisfactory to all, it certainly is offensive to none. Our English brethren do not divide on Christ's leadership, but on the grounds of his authority; both parties acknowledge him as their spiritual leader. The present preamble is also the more progressive of the two. The friends of the amendment wish to distinguish the eternal truth in Christianity from the human personality of the truth-speaker. They would put loyalty to the truth in the place of loyalty to the truth-teller. But truth and truth-teller are one in Christ. He did not expect his brethren to accept his views of Christ, but found in the large tolerance and catholic spirit of the body room and sympathy. As he stood by the flag of the nation, which is no flaunting liberty-cap, but the stars and stripes, signifying liberty and union, so he stood by the cross of Christ, the Son of the living God.

Rev. Mr. Towne made a very earnest speech in favour of the amendment, reading from letters of Dr. Bartol, and from another gentleman whose father once held a prominent position in our body, in favour of his views. He was quite satisfied that the amendment would have been adopted had the question gone before the Conference on its own merits without prejudice on either side. In reply to Mr. Mayo, he asked if the giving up of the *supernatural* lordship of Christ was giving up all leadership? Is not God, our dear Father in heaven, our Leader still? Do we ask for a greater or better Lord than the Lord of heaven and earth? When men point to Christ as the pattern of perfection, he remembered that Christ himself pointed to God, and said, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

Rev. Robert Collyer was pained at the idea of secession, and it made him feel very unpleasantly to hear his dear brother Bellows express himself in the way he did. He was bound to oppose secession anyway. He sympathized very largely with the young men in their feelings and struggles. But though he had very much in common with the movers of this amendment, he differed from them in some things; yet the difference does not hinder our friendship and our working together. These young men must see how much we all love them, and how truly they are at home here in this Conference where they have so much in common with all

the rest, and he begged them to let minor points of opinion drop out of sight in the heartiness with which they joined with us in lifting up humanity.

Rev. Rufus Ellis could not allow that the opinions in question were of minor importance. They are fundamental. He respected the young men for their sincerity; but if they cannot accept the preamble as it stands, and work on the platform of the Conference without a sacrifice of self-respect, they ought to withdraw. This is the manly way. Everybody would honour them for quitting a body they could not conscientiously stay in and work with, and forming one of their own. He believed that they could make a strong society, for they had elements of great vigour. But for himself, he could not stay in any organization that was not unequivocally committed to Jesus Christ, the personal Redeemer.

After further remarks by various ministers and laymen, the vote was taken, and the amendment proposed by Mr. Abbott was defeated by a large majority.

The evening session was held in Wieting Hall—a large and beautiful building capable of holding twenty-five hundred people, which was nearly filled with interested auditors. At this meeting the claims of the Missionary enterprise were considered, and much encouraging information was given by the several speakers.

A meeting was held for devotional services at half-past eight o'clock on Thursday morning. About ten o'clock the proceedings of the Conference were resumed, and the subject of local conferences was taken up on the motion of the Rev. E. Hale. Afterwards a paper was read by the Rev. Mr. Tilden on "The Ministry, and the Methods of Increasing it." At the afternoon session the Meadville Theological School was considered. The Rev. A. A. Livermore gave an interesting account of the condition and wants of that institution, and made an urgent appeal on its behalf. After speeches from several of the members a subscription was started, and in a short time the whole amount required (thirty thousand dollars) was raised. Among other resolutions adopted was one, to the effect "that the renewed efforts for the removal of intemperance throughout the country should receive their hearty encouragement, and that all should be encouraged to help on the work by their personal protest of word and example against the drinking usages of society;" and another, binding themselves to raise *one hundred thousand dollars* annually for denominational purposes. The closing meeting was held on Thursday evening, when eloquent addresses were delivered by several ministers, and the benediction was pronounced by the Rev. S. J. May.

ORDINATION OF THE REV. RICHARD A. ARMSTRONG AT BANBRIDGE.

On Friday, Nov. 23, the Presbytery of Antrim met in the Second Non-Subscribing Church, Banbridge, for the purpose of ordaining the Rev. Richard A. Armstrong to the charge of that congregation. The introductory services were conducted by the Rev. John Porter, Belfast, who preached from John iii. 8—"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the

devil." The Rev. Samuel C. Nelson defended Presbyterian ordination, and dwelt at considerable length on the principles of Non-Subscription held and practised by the Presbytery of Antrim since its formation 140 years ago.

Mr. Gilbert Mulligan, being called upon by Mr. Nelson, read the following resolution which had been agreed to at a meeting of the congregation:—"Resolved—That having fully satisfied ourselves of the ability and adequacy of the Rev. Richard Armstrong to administer to our spiritual wants, and in order to place on record at the approaching ordination our unswerving attachment to the great principles of Non-Subscription, we desire it to be distinctly understood that we, as a congregation, in the selection of a minister, consider ourselves individually the only judges in all matters pertaining to our eternal salvation; consequently we do not wish the Presbytery at the ordination to impose upon Mr. Armstrong any confession of faith or theological test, but to ordain him in accordance with the uniform practice of the rev. the Presbytery of Antrim, since its formation in 1726. In inviting Mr. Armstrong to become our minister, we ask him to declare to us at all times fully the whole counsel of God, and we hereby repudiate for ourselves, and deny on the part of any others, the right to fetter his judgment or to control his opinions upon religious subjects. Further, that our free ecclesiastical principles may be publicly known, we hereby authorise a copy of the above resolution to be handed to the Presbytery, with a request that they will, if they think fit, have it read aloud from the pulpit at the approaching ordination, in order that it may be embodied and published as part of the proceedings."

Mr. Armstrong, being asked if he had any statement to make, said he was there that day rather to hear and drink in spiritual wisdom and gain strength than bestow upon them his poor wisdom. Those to whom it had been his privilege to minister from that pulpit, during the few weeks he had spent among them, would bear him witness that he was agitated when he regarded the Christian ministry and its duties. It was with trembling and prayer he accepted the call to be their pastor. He had been asked what he conceived to be his duties, and he conceived it to be his duty, week by week, to speak from that pulpit—to utter, as God might reveal it to his heart, faithfully. He conceived it to be a yet greater duty, at all times and seasons, to enter the dwellings of those who had chosen him to be their pastor—striving to bear to the sick an alleviation of their pain—to the dying, some hopes of the life that knows no death—to the bereaved, some consolation greater than earth can afford. He conceived it to be his duty to visit the homes of the prosperous and happy—to strive to bear to them some sense of their responsibility in prosperity—some sense of the spirit of usefulness which should animate their lives. Above all, he conceived it to be his duty, in his daily and hourly transactions, to walk humbly, hopefully, before God, trusting that deeds and thoughts and a Christian life would be of more influence in the Christian ministry than any feeble words he might utter. Such was the standard he dared to aim at. It was a lofty spiritual one. He was youthful, inexperienced, weak, erring, and sinful, and yet he dared to strive to do these things. So far as he made these high

aims his purpose through life, so far would he be faithful to his trust; but so far as he lost sight of them, so far he would be faithless to the people and to God. He hoped the great God would bless his ministry, enabling him faithfully and as a Christian minister to discharge the duties that lay before him, and he besought all to join with him in that prayer.

The congregation having signified their adhesion to the call, the ordination prayer was offered up by Mr. Nelson, after which the members of Presbytery and some members of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster gave the young minister the right hand of fellowship. The Rev. William James then delivered the charge to the minister, pointing out, in an eloquent discourse, the duties he owed to the congregation and to God. The Rev. William Hall gave the charge to the people, after which a hymn was sung, and the interesting proceedings closed with the benediction.

At the close of the ordination services, the officiating clergymen and other friends were entertained at dinner by the members of the congregation. About eighty sat down to table, Gilbert Mulligan, Esq., of Parkmount, occupying the chair, and J. W. Gordon, Esq., Belfast, the vice-chair. Thanks having been returned, the Chairman proposed the usual loyal toasts, which were duly honoured. John Hancock, Esq., J.P., responded to "The Lord Lieutenant and Prosperity to Ireland."

The CHAIRMAN then gave "The guest of the evening, Richard A. Armstrong," who had come to settle amongst them. Mr. Armstrong was a stranger, but he hoped he would not long be so; and it must have been gratifying to him that day to see not only the members of his own Presbytery, but also the members of the Remonstrant Synod, coming forward to hold out the right hand of fellowship.

Mr. ARMSTRONG returned thanks, and said that with all his love for his native land—and it was not slight—in any town or village throughout England he could not have felt at home sooner than he had in Banbridge. He would not be expected to say much that night, but he might be allowed to state what he conceived the duties of his office to be. He had spoken from the pulpit and in the church that day on the subject, and he trusted his own life would be the best comment on it for the future. It seemed to him that one of the great duties of a minister of religion at the present time was to keep distinctly defined before his mind the enormous difference between theology and religion. He found that the nature of the Godhead and kindred subjects had been so discussed that they might be considered as matters of our religion. Many evils had arisen in their discussion. He found that the differences between them were to be more insisted upon than a union. This he conceived to be a vast mistake. This he conceived to work more evil throughout the Christian world than perhaps any other work amongst them. He conceived that, however they might differ on points of theology and points of Church discipline, there was one point on which they were united, and that point was—"We live in a world not as good as it ought to be, and it is for us to strive to make it better." It would be his humble effort to devote his attention to the pure duties of Christian life as

first and foremost—all other things coming after, in his estimation. Many of them were probably aware that some forty years ago his father was a clergyman of the Church of England, and preached to a congregation in a seaside town in the County Down—the town of Bangor. He left Bangor for conscience' sake, because he felt he could not accept the authority imposed upon him. After a lapse of some years, he became a minister of Unitarian Christianity in Bristol. It was a strange coincidence that he had returned to the very county which his father had left. It was a very gratifying sight to him that night to witness the presence of representatives of many creeds, or more creeds, and he hoped that in their several spheres they would endeavour to prepare for the time of the Lord, when all would be peace and happiness.

The Rev. William Hall responded to "Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over;" the Rev. John Porter to "The Officiating Ministers;" and the Rev. David Watson to "The Presbytery of Antrim."

The CHAIRMAN next gave "The Rev. William James, and our English brethren."

Mr. JAMES said he was specially indebted to many friends in Ireland for the honour they had done him in frequently asking him to their anniversaries. More than twenty years ago he had been received as a guest in the house of the late Robert Andrews, in Dublin, when over to preach before the Irish Unitarian Association. After a warm eulogy on the private worth and public character of the deceased gentleman, Mr. James proceeded to say that their English brethren regarded them with friendship, and always took a deep interest in the progress of liberal Christianity in this country. It would be desirable and useful if some plan could be devised for far more frequent intercourse and co-operation. He then referred to the loss they had sustained in the death of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery. They had their little differences in England as well as in this country, and as it was commonly believed in this country that their English brethren were open to the charge of unbelief, he wished to say that the majority of their brethren in England—it might be said all of them—believed in one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ. Whilst all in Ireland wished to stand up for what they believed to be truth and right, yet they should bear with one another, try to forget the past, and accord to one another that liberty which each wished for himself. They laboured in the same good cause, and they should try to respect one another, and live as brethren. They had been accustomed to receive from them many valued ministers, and they in return had now called among them a young and very dear friend of his own, who he hoped would long be spared to labour among them. He had known Mr. Armstrong from his boyhood, and had never known anything but good of him. They had great faith in blood; and a better, nobler, more righteous man he never knew than Mr. Armstrong's father. He had laboured with him for seventeen years, and a discordant feeling never arose between them during that time. He was delighted to see his son surrounded by those who were determined to support him in the duties and trials of the ministry. It was a good and pleasant thing to see them gathering around him, entering into his views and feelings, and he believed by such a course it would be better in the

long run for the congregation. He would carry back to England his most grateful impressions of that meeting, and the knowledge that they shared the sentiments of their English brethren.

The CHAIRMAN then gave "Our American Brethren." The Rev. Mr. Dickson responded in an eloquent and interesting speech, in which he gave some details regarding the workings of the Church in America.—"Our Remonstrant Brethren who have joined us in welcoming Mr. Armstrong,"—"Our Friends of other Denominations who have favoured us with their presence this evening,"—"The Health of the Rev. David Gordon,"—"Non-Sectarian Education,"—"The Press," and other toasts were afterwards given.

[The foregoing report of proceedings at the Banbridge ordination are abridged from the *Northern Whig*. We must express our disappointment, however, that that journal has not supplied fuller particulars both of the services in the church and of the after-dinner speeches. We regret that there is no outline of the sermon, and especially of that portion of it which referred to the miracles of Christ and the feats of the Indian juggler; and also that no sketch is given of the Rev. S. C. Nelson's address, in which he explained, or more correctly *exposed*, Presbyterian ordination, and denounced those who object to the new principle of "*absolute religious liberty*," as "retrograde and Judaizing Christians." But, above all, we regret that the report of the Rev. D. Watson's speech is softened down, and all the gall and bitterness discharged from it; and that not a word is said of the mortification, confusion, and indignation which that speech created,—more than one gentleman leaving the room, not wishing to expose themselves to farther insult; and several ministers of the Remonstrant Synod, who have not leagued themselves with the "ultra" party, repelling Mr. Watson's ungenerous attack, and defending the principles which he had most unjustly assailed. This "scene" the *Whig* does not hint at. Perhaps its reporter left the banquet-room too early. Be that as it may, our English brethren might suppose, from so imperfect a report, that all had passed off satisfactorily, while on no former occasion of a similar kind was there more to offend Christian principle, or disturb Christian peace. Our space is exhausted, and we shall reserve for next month a criticism on these Ordination Services.—ED. CH. UN.]

OBITUARY.

Died, at the residence of her son in-law, W. B. Caughey, Esq., Queen's Square, Belfast, on November 11, Leah, relict of the late John Lamont, Belfast, aged 89 years.

Died, at his residence, Downshire Place, Newry, on November 10, Robert Greer, Esq., aged 69 years. For nearly forty years Mr. Greer held a public position in Newry, and was much esteemed by his townsmen for his superior intelligence and high integrity. He was a prominent member of the Unitarian Church in Newry, and was justly held in great respect by the religious body with which he was connected.

THE

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. V.] JANUARY, 1867. [No. 12.

AN ORDINATION ON THE "ABSOLUTE LIBERTY" PRINCIPLE.

WE published, in our Intelligence department, last month a report of proceedings at an ordination lately held in Banbridge. The Congregation, which is in connexion with the Presbytery of Antrim, had become vacant some time ago, by the pastor having retired from the work of the Christian ministry and turned his attention to mercantile pursuits; and a unanimous call had been presented to the Rev. Richard A. Armstrong, the son of one whose name is held in deserved honour among Unitarians everywhere, and whose interesting and successful labours in the cause of Christian truth and human freedom were sketched in an article in an earlier volume of *The Christian Unitarian*, entitled, "A Confessor of the Present Century." Various circumstances combined to render the occasion one of much interest, and every arrangement was made by the Presbytery to make it as imposing and impressive as possible. The most distinguished ministers of the Presbytery were appointed to conduct the services, aided by the Rev. W. James, of Bristol, to whose congregation the young minister had belonged. Invitations were sent to all ministers of the Remonstrant Synod who were known, or supposed, to have proclivities to the "Absolute Religious Liberty" principles of the Antrim Presbytery; and several *puff* paragraphs appeared in the *Northern Whig* to draw general attention to the event. Accordingly, on the appointed day a large congregation was assembled, comprising not only the ordinary worshippers in the meeting-house, but persons of various religious denominations, including many from the First Non-Subscribing Congregation of Banbridge.

The introductory services were conducted by the Rev. John Porter, of Belfast, who preached from 1 John iii. 8—"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." The text was appropriate, and might have given a right tone to the whole proceedings, exhibiting the manifestation of Christ as the great instrumentality appointed by God for the redemption of the world, and the great theme which should engage the thoughts and give direction to the labours of the Christian pastor: but, unfortunately, the leading drift of the sermon, as we have been informed, was to lower the dignity, and make light of the miracles, of our Lord, and to represent as the only important part of Christianity, the precepts, spirit, and moral life of its founder. The Rev. Samuel C. Nelson followed: to him had been assigned the explanation and defence of Presbyterian ordination; but the tenor of his address was to set aside all authority on the part of a Presbytery, to denounce and misrepresent those who had ventured to think differently from himself, and to flatter, in coaxing and fulsome terms, those Remonstrant ministers whom he supposed to be weak enough in mind, or in faith, to accept his ideas about ordination. He accused those who, in the maintenance of their Christian principles, had seceded from the Presbytery some years ago, as "retrograde and Judaizing Christians." Why "retrograde," we would ask? Is it because, while he and his friends have got new ideas of religious liberty, these men adhere to their former principles? Is it because they cannot embrace or endorse every wild and sceptical notion which, in the last thirty years, has been propounded in the dishonoured and violated name of Christianity? Let Mr. Nelson represent those who have been constrained to differ from him as "stationary," or even, as an elder of his Presbytery has elegantly expressed it, as *stick-in-the-muds*,—for to some everything of Christian principle seems worthless as *mud*,—but let him not accuse them of relapsing into the creed bondage which their Presbyterial ancestors renounced in 1726. The views which they held from the time of their ordination, and which the whole Presbytery, till recently, seemed to hold, on the subject of religious liberty, are the views which they still entertain

and profess; and if others have "advanced," as certainly they have, let not these be unjustly represented as "retrogrades." But Mr. Nelson accuses them of being "Judaizing" Christians. Why so? They do not contend for circumcision, nor for Jewish Sabbaths, nor for Jewish anything. The Jews denied the mission of Christ —Do they? The very opposite. While Mr. Nelson and his co-adjutors regard Christ's Divine Mission as "an open question," and are ready, at the bidding of any congregation, to ordain a man who sees nothing more divine in Christ than in John Howard or Elizabeth Fry, those whom he stigmatizes as "Judaizing" distinctly declare that they will be parties to the ordination of no one who does not acknowledge his belief in that which the Jew denies, and the Presbytery of Antrim undervalues—the special mission of Christ from God.

Towards the close of Mr. Nelson's address he called on Mr. Gilbert Mulligan, the principal member of the congregation, to read a resolution which, it seems, had been adopted at a meeting of seatholders on the previous Sunday. It is as follows:—

"That, having fully satisfied ourselves of the ability and adequacy of the Rev. Richard Armstrong to administer to our spiritual wants, and in order to place on record at the approaching ordination our unswerving attachment to the great principles of Non-Subscription, we desire it to be distinctly understood that we, as a congregation, in the selection of a minister, consider ourselves individually the only judges in all matters pertaining to our eternal salvation; consequently we do not wish the Presbytery at the ordination to impose upon Mr. Armstrong any confession of faith or theological test, but to ordain him in accordance with the uniform practice of the rev. the Presbytery of Antrim, since its formation in 1726. In inviting Mr. Armstrong to become our minister, we ask him to declare to us at all times fully the whole counsel of God, and we hereby repudiate for ourselves, and deny on the part of any others, the right to fetter his judgment or to control his opinions upon religious subjects. Further, that our free ecclesiastical principles may be publicly known, we hereby authorise a copy of the above resolution to be handed to the Presbytery, with a request that they will, if they think fit, have it read aloud from the pulpit at the approaching ordination, in order that it may be embodied and published as part of the proceedings."

Now, Mr. Mulligan and his fellow-worshippers had a perfect right to satisfy themselves respecting the ability and adequacy of him whom they called to minister to their

spiritual wants; and no consistent Protestant would deny that they are themselves to judge in all matters pertaining to their eternal salvation. But are there no rights and no duties belonging to the Presbytery? Does not the act of ordination give to the minister the position which he is to hold as a co-presbyter? And are they to be mere cyphers in a service so solemn, or the mere tools of Messrs. Gilbert Mulligan and Company? Are they not, also, to satisfy themselves of the adequacy of the candidate to preach the Gospel, before they solemnly set him apart to such an office by the laying on of hands? A spectacle more humiliating than that service presented we can hardly conceive—a body of professing Christian ministers going through the solemn form of ordaining, by the imposition of hands, one of whose religious and Christian principles, so far as appears, and so far as the congregational resolution implies, they knew absolutely nothing. He might have been a Deist, a Jew, a Mahommedan—anything, or nothing; for it is to be observed that the young minister, perhaps by order of the rulers of the synagogue, was as silent as the grave respecting his Christian views, and dwelt only on his Christian duties. The word "Christian," to be sure, occurs in his addresss; but we know how loosely and freely that term is employed, being used now-a-days to signify anyone who approves of the precepts of Christ's religion, whether he believes in Christ as a reality, or only a myth—in God as a spirit, or only a law. Some of the Remonstrant ministers, sympathising, it is to be presumed, with the new principles of the Antrim Presbytery, joined in this saddening ceremony; but others, we are glad to know, declined the invitation to do so, and, by keeping their seats, silently but significantly protested against it.

But this resolution refers to the "great principle of Non-subscription," and "the uniform practice of the Presbytery of Antrim since its foundation in 1726." Of course, Mr. Mulligan and the other members of the congregation know nothing themselves of the principles of Non-subscription or of the practice of the Presbytery since its formation: they swallow whatever they are told, no matter how latitudinarian, on this subject; but we are glad to have an opportunity of enlightening them. Non-

subscription, when the term was first used, prior to the separation of the Presbytery of Antrim from the General Synod of Ulster—and down to a very recent period—did not imply "Absolute Religious Liberty," nor was it ever used to cover unbelief. It simply expressed the rejection of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and similar human tests, and the upholding of the authority of Scripture as a sufficient rule of faith. Nor was that test, "the Scriptures our rule of faith," the unmeaning phrase which many now regard it; recently our ingenious casuists have sublimated it so far that it has lost all its force, and is supposed by some to be simply a protest against human authority. "I could profess my acceptance of the Scriptures as my sole rule of faith," remarked an intelligent and influential layman lately, "meaning thereby that I approve of the precepts of Christianity, although I disbelieve everything supernatural which they relate, and regard Jesus as only a man, more given to study and contemplation than other men of his time." How the founders of the Antrim Presbytery would have protested against so disingenuous a use of terms! and if now, from some higher sphere, they can look down on events which are occurring in the scenes of their earthly labours, how they must sorrow to know that the great principle of religious freedom, for which they contended so nobly, has been employed to give shelter and respectability to unbelief!

But what, let us ask, were the principles of the Presbytery respecting ordination? Happily, we have them set forth by the founders of the Presbytery themselves, in a letter addressed to the congregations under their care, immediately after the separation from the General Synod.

"Candidates for the holy ministry may give clear and sufficient evidence of their soundness in the faith without subscribing or professing an assent to any one imposed uninspired form of articles, or confession of faith; and they may as fully satisfy their ordainers concerning their fitness to preach the Christian faith without subscribing any such confession, as they may prove their aptness to preside in the public worship of God without declaring their assent to any prescribed human liturgy or form of prayer.

"We are humbly of opinion that the great Head of the church hath given no power to the church to make any canon or religious law by which an intrant into the ministry, who gives sufficient proof of his soundness in the faith, and of his having all the other

ministerial qualifications and abilities required in the Gospel, shall be refused License to preach the Gospel, Ordination, or Instalment, merely because he refuseth to give his assent or subscription to the Westminster Confession as the sole and exclusive test of Orthodoxy and term of ministerial communion."*

Farther, in a Defence of the Letter from which we have made the foregoing extracts, they say that, "at their ordination, they made a solemn profession of our holy religion, which was satisfactory to the churches which chose them to be their pastors, and to their ordainers;" and one of the original members of the Presbytery, writing prior to the disruption, in defence of Non-Subscription, says:—

"Neither is it my opinion that ministers are obliged immediately to license or ordain any candidate for the ministry, if he shall acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God. I think that they may demand some rational satisfaction that the person whom they are to ordain understands the Christian doctrine, and is apt to teach it—which may be had by examining the person to be ordained, and by allowing him to preach before his ordainers concerning the most important subjects, or to draw up in his own words an account of the principles and grounds of his faith."†

Such were the original principles of the Presbytery, and such the views of its founders; and yet this Banbridge resolution, drawn out, most probably, by one of the ministers, refers to "the uniform practice of the Presbytery of Antrim since its formation in 1726," as if it bore out the principle of "no questions asked," while it does the very opposite. We venture to affirm, although the Presbytery's minutes are too vague to give the desired information, that in no case was any minister ordained without the Presbytery having been satisfied of his fitness for the work of the ministry. In the case of Mr. Armstrong, we ask, what was there to satisfy his ordainers? Nothing. There does not seem to have been even proposed to him the standard question or test which till now has, we believe, been uniformly asked—Do you accept the Holy Scriptures as your sole rule of Faith? The only evidence the Presbytery seems to have had of his fitness for the ministerial office is the resolution of Mr. Mulligan, which declares that the congregation are satisfied of his ability

* Letter from the Presbytery of Antrim to the congregations under their care, pages 7, 8.

† Haliday's Reasons against the Imposition of Subscription, page 7.

and adequacy. Thus the tables are turned; and if, in other sections of the Presbyterian Church, the ministers have tyrannized over the people, in this free church at Banbridge it would appear that the people have resolved to ride rough-shod over the Presbytery; and more, that the Presbytery, in their blind love for what they call religious liberty, but what we regard as irreligious licentiousness, are ready, by the solemn act of ordination, to certify as well qualified to preach the Gospel, any one of whose ability and adequacy Mr. Mulligan and others are satisfied, without themselves presuming to inquire how far his religious principles render him fit to be a co-presbyter, or even knowing whether he is Christian, Deist, Secularist, or what he is!

In these times we are nothing if we are not advancing. Four years ago—subsequently to the disruption of the Presbytery—the Rev. W. O. M'Gowan was installed at Ravara; and the officiating minister, the Rev. Hugh Moore, addressing the congregation, said:—

"If Mr. M'Gowan were a very young man, appearing before us for the first time as a candidate for license to preach the Gospel, we would, in accordance with the uniform practice of the Presbytery of Antrim, endeavour to ascertain, either by personal inquiries or by testimonials from trustworthy parties, that he had received a regular education; that the faculties of his mind were fairly unfolded; that he had shown himself to be acquainted with the Scriptures, and well qualified to illustrate their doctrines, and to enforce their precepts; that he adhered to those great principles by which our Church has been distinguished since the period of its formation up till the present time—namely, the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice, and the right of private judgment in matters of religion, to the rejection of all human tests, creeds, or confessions of faith. . . . While the Presbytery of Antrim has never, in any instance, put doctrinal tests to candidates for license, ordination, or installation, but has contented itself by personal inquiry or otherwise as to the fitness of the person for the work in which he is about to engage, and especially whether, with Chillingworth, he takes the Bible as his creed, and regards the Scriptures as a sufficient rule of faith and of practice, it has been the uniform practice to request the person chosen to state, for the satisfaction of the congregation, and that there may be no ground for misapprehension hereafter, clearly and distinctly his views on entering on the work of the ministry, and to answer any questions the congregation or installing ministers may choose to put to him."*

* See *Northern Whig* of November 14, 1862.

It would thus appear that the Presbytery is advancing with rapid strides, and by and by we may expect to find the form of ordination entirely set aside, and any person, educated or not educated, Christian or not Christian, admitted as a member of this free Presbytery, on the certificate of the leading members of a congregation that they have satisfied themselves of his ability and adequacy to minister to their spiritual wants. In truth, the recent ordination was nothing more than this.

We have been informed that the address of the Rev. W. James to the new minister, in whom personally he felt a deep interest, was eloquent, appropriate, and thoroughly Christian, and, as it was remarked, was the only redeeming feature in the entire services. One person, not a Unitarian, who was present, said, on leaving the meeting-house, that it was the first time he had attended a service of the kind, in which Christ was made of no account. The criticism was severe, but many Unitarians who were present admit that it was just.

At the public dinner, which was held at the close of the religious services, many persons of respectability and position, not connected with the congregation, attended to express their interest in the occasion, and to welcome the new pastor to their neighbourhood. But such kindly sentiments were but ill reciprocated by this free and liberal Presbytery; for when one of its members, the Rev. D. Watson, rose to respond to "the Presbytery of Antrim," he delivered a carefully prepared speech, in which he eulogized himself and his friends, abused those who, in the exercise of free thought, had ventured to differ from them, and sought, by clap-trap phrases, to gull the audience. "The principle of the Presbytery," he said, "was, still is, and he hoped would continue to be, *the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.*" Now, seriously, does Mr. Watson—does any of his brethren—does any intelligent Protestant, of any sect, in the present day, accept such a principle? We are sure not; but he hoped by such a hackneyed phrase to catch the applause of his hearers, especially when he concluded the grandiloquent sentence with the cry of "*No Surrender.*" If there were any Orangemen present, we have no doubt that they, at

least, cheered him lustily. But when he rudely and bitterly assailed those who had ventured to plead for the necessity of demanding from all candidates for ordination in Non-Subscribing churches, an acknowledgment of their belief in the Divine authority of Revelation; and when he abused them as creed-makers and bigots, some looked at him in amazement, others hung their heads in embarrassment—even the chairman looked disconcerted, for he knew the mischief he was doing; and when he concluded, various gentlemen indignantly rose and left the room, among them the minister who was to have responded to "The Remonstrant Synod," feeling that, while they attended from motives of kindness and good-neighbourhood, they had been treated with insult and misrepresentation. We are glad to know that several ministers of the Remonstrant Synod, who remained, replied to this ungenerous attack; and when Mr. Watson explained that he meant no allusion to Remonstrants, but only to the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, one of them rejoined—"Yes; Mr. Watson has not courage enough to attack those who are here to reply; but he meanly assails the absent, who have no opportunity of defending themselves." This portion of the after-dinner proceedings was the most exciting and characteristic, and many wonder what influence was brought to bear on the *Northern Whig* reporter, which led him entirely to suppress it.

The Rev. W. James, when called on to respond to "Our English Brethren," referred in graceful terms, not reported in the *Whig*, to the loss which Liberal Christianity has sustained by the death of the late Dr. Montgomery. "To his many noble qualities, valuable services, and important labours," he said, "whether on the side he had taken in their recent controversies or against him, he was quite sure there was no one present who could not readily bear witness." He then spoke of the differences which had recently arisen here and in England in the Unitarian body, and we much regret that we have ground to complain of the terms in which he alluded to them. If he has been a silent, he cannot have been an indifferent observer of the grounds of dissension either here on the other side of the channel; and he must be fully aware that the main question which has divided the body is that of the divine

mission of the Saviour. Many years ago Mr. James published a volume of sermons on the Christian miracles, in the preface to which occurs the following passage:—

"The author was induced to call the attention of his people to the subject of our Lord's miracles, in consequence of what appears to be a growing disposition at home and abroad, to 'set aside or to push out of sight all that is external and authoritative in Christianity.' Speculations have been recently indulged with reference to the miracles of the Gospel, which, as the author believes, strike at the root of our faith in the divine mission and supernatural authority of the Saviour. And persuaded that the mighty works of Jesus afford the best and strongest evidence that God was with him, he felt that it was his duty to declare his views publicly to those to whom he ministers, on this important subject."

We have no reason to believe that Mr. James regards the divine mission of the Saviour as less important now than at the time when his Sermons were published, and he cannot, we think, with any consistency, regard the principle on which the Northern Presbytery seceded from the parent body as a "little difference." He would, therefore, have been taking a more honourable and consistent, though not, we admit, a more convenient course, if, at that ordination dinner, referring to the differences that had for some time existed, he had spoken in some such terms as the following:—"I regret that here, as in England, a division has arisen among Liberal Christians, but I must freely confess that the ground of that division is a question which directly affects the authority of the Christian religion, and that my sympathies are entirely, on this point, with those who have seceded from you. I admit, however, that you have a right to adopt whatever views you believe to be true on this and on every other question; and no diversity of opinion, though it necessarily prevents co-operation for the promulgation of Christian truth, should alienate friends, or prompt the bitter and abusive language which has so seriously disturbed the harmony of this evening's meeting."

As some of those who may read this article are more rash than logical in their interpretation of language, we beg distinctly to state that we do not accuse Mr. Porter of disbelieving the miracles of Christ, although, in his sermon, he "set them aside, or pushed them out of sight;" and that we do not charge any of the ministers of the

Presbytery of Antrim with Deism; but we do maintain that the new "absolute liberty" principle which they have embraced throws the pulpits of the body open to rank unbelievers, and robs their organization of everything that is distinctively Christian. And farther, we beg to assure the young minister, of whom, from various sources, we have had reason to form a most favourable estimate, that we entertain no hostile feeling towards him; and to express our fervent wish that he may be enabled, notwithstanding the unfavourable associations with which he is surrounded, to do a good and Christian work in the Church over which he has been settled.

MY BOY.

I CANNOT make him dead!
His fair sunshiny head
Is ever bounding round my study chair;
Yet when my eyes, now dim
With tears, I turn to him,
The vision vanishes—he is not there!

I walk my parlour floor,
And, through the open door,
I hear a footfall on the chamber stair;
I'm stepping toward the hall,
To give the boy a call,
And then bethink me that—he is not there

I tread the crowded street,
A satchel'd lad I meet,
With the same beaming eyes and coloured hair;
And, as he's running by,
Follow him with my eye,
Scarcely believing that—he is not there!

I know his face is hid
Under the coffin lid;
Closed are his eyes; cold his forehead fair;
My hand that marble felt:
O'er it in prayer I knelt;
Yet my heart whispers that—he is not there!

I cannot *make* him dead!
When passing by his bed,
So long watched over with paternal care,
My spirit and my eye
Seek it imploringly,
Before the thought comes—he is not there!

When at the cool, gray break
Of day, from sleep I wake,
With my first breathing of the morning air,
My soul goes up with joy,
To Him who gave my boy—
Then comes the sad thought that—he is not there!

When at the day's calm close,
Before we seek repose,
I'm with his mother, offering up our prayer,
Whate'er I may be *saying*,
I am, in spirit, praying
For our boy's spirit, though—he is not there!

Not there! Where, then, is he?
The form I used to see
Was but the *raiment* that he used to wear.
The grave that now doth press
Upon the cast-off dress,
Is but his wardrobe locked—he is not there!

He lives! in all the past
He lives; nor, to the last,
Of seeing him again will I despair;
In dreams I see him now,
And on his angel brow
I see is written, "Thou shalt see me *there!*"

Yes, we all live to God!
Father, thy chastening rod
So help us, thine afflicted ones, to bear,
That, in the spirit-land,
Meeting at thy right hand,
'Twill be our heaven to find that—he is *there.*

J. Pierpont.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. V.—GLENARM.

(*Concluded from page* 373.)

XII. Thomas Smyth was minister of the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm from 1836 to 1852, during all which time he was assistant to Mr. Montgomery the senior minister, who, as already stated, survived until 1853.

Mr. Smyth was ordained at Glenarm by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick, on Tuesday, May 3, 1836, on which occasion the Rev. Robert Campbell, of Templepatrick, preached from Acts iii. 26; the Rev. James Mulligan, of Cairncastle, explained and defended Presbyterian ordination; the Rev. Thomas Alexander, of Cairncastle, offered up the ordination prayer; and the Rev. Mr. Glendy, of Ballycarry, delivered the usual charge to minister and people. At the time of Mr. Smyth's ordination, I have reason to believe that the Congregation of Glenarm consisted of very nearly 100 seatholders, paying a stipend of £21 10s. 6d.

My account of Mr. Smyth's ministry in Glenarm, as indeed of the incumbencies of his successors there, must be somewhat brief, for my materials are limited, and the facts are few. Two years after his settlement a "neat and valuable pulpit Bible" (as stated in *The Bible Christian*, viii. 42), was presented to his congregation by Mrs Mathews of Dublin. This lady, whose maiden name was Dickey, and who was a member of the respectable family of that name which has long been settled in County Antrim, was an occasional resident at Glenarm during the summer months. While there, she was a regular attendant at the old meeting-house, and being dissatisfied with the appearance of the venerable folio Bible which was then in the pulpit, she presented the congregation with a new one, which is still in use.

On January 28, 1841 (as recorded in *The Bible Christian*, xii. 66), the teachers of the Glenarm Sunday School in connection with the Remonstrant Congregation, entertained the children attending their school at tea, which (by the kind permission of Mr. Thomas Davison) was served in the room then used as a court-house.

A few years afterwards the old Congregation of Glenarm sustained a severe loss by the death of one of its most intelligent and useful members, Mr. William Gibson, of Unchenaugh, who died at his residence near Glenarm, on July 17, 1843, in the 60th year of his age. Mr. William Gibson was an elder in the Remonstrant Congregation of Glenarm, and it is truly stated, in an obituary notice of him which appeared in *The Bible Christian*, xiv. 407, that "he took a deep interest in the affairs of the worshipping society to which he belonged." In this respect I am happy to add that he has in the present day a worthy representative in his brother, Mr. John Gibson, of Unchenaugh.

On October 3, 1843, the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick held its usual quarterly meeting at Glenarm, and in the evening the members of Presbytery were entertained at tea by the congregation, "in their neat and comfortable meeting-house," as reported in *The Bible Christian*, xiv. 438. The senior minister, Rev. A. Montgomery, occupied the chair, and the large and respectable audience, which included persons of various religious persuasions, was addressed by several ministers, amongst others by the junior minister, Mr. Smyth, who "gave a most satisfactory account of the perfect harmony subsisting between him and the members of his congregation, and also of the kindness and Christian feeling manifested towards him by the respectable portion of all denominations of Christians in the neighbourhood." Mr. Smyth concluded by proposing the memory of the late Mr. William Gibson," which was received in solemn silence, and every person present appeared to be affected with the most intense sorrow at the mention of their former fellow-worshipper, who was then only a few months dead.

About a year afterwards, viz., on October 22, 1844 (as recorded in *The Bible Christian*, xv. 431), "the Remonstrant Congregation of Glenarm held a soiree in their meeting-house, for the purpose of expressing their gratitude to their friends of other religious denominations who had come forward so kindly to get up and sign petitions on their behalf, during the progress of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. This must have been a pleasing duty to

every member of the congregation, for in no other locality did the members of other religious communities manifest a greater interest in the success of their Remonstrant brethren than in that of Glenarm. The meeting was numerous and respectable. After tea, on the motion of Rev. A. Montgomery, and seconded by Rev. T. Smyth, George S Halloran, Esq., was called to the chair, when several suitable sentiments were proposed and spoken to by Rev. Messrs. Campbell, Glendy, Montgomery, Smyth, and H. Martin, Esq."

On June 2, 1852, Mr. Smyth resigned the pastoral charge of the Congregation of Glenarm, having been appointed to the Congregation of Raloo, of which he is still the minister.

XIII. JOHN JELLIE was, on September 28, 1852, ordained by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm, which then comprised 82 seatholders, paying an annual stipend of £20 6s. 6d. This situation Mr. Jellie resigned on January 29, 1855, having been appointed to the Congregation of Ravara in County Down.

XIV. JAMES CALLWELL, who had previously been minister of Newtownlimavady in County Derry, was, on May 29, 1855, installed by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm, which then comprised 76 seatholders, paying an annual stipend of £18 18s. 6d.

During the ministry of Mr. Callwell in Glenarm, viz., on September 29, 1862, the centenary of the building of the present meeting-house was celebrated by a most successful commemorative meeting, which was held in the meeting-house and attended by a large and respectable auditory, including persons of various religious denominations, who were suitably addressed by the late Dr. Montgomery and other ministers.

Mr. Callwell, who has now been eleven years settled in Glenarm, is still the minister of the Old Presbyterian Congregation of that town, which comprises at

present 73 seatholders, paying an annual stipend of £17 12s. 6d.

As to the CONGREGATIONAL PROPERTY belonging to the worshipping society with which we have been now concerned, I believe it consists entirely of the Meeting-house, which is a large rectangular building with three galleries, the Session-house, which is a small erection in one corner of the meeting-house green, and the Meeting-house green itself, which is large and commodious, and enclosed on all sides by a substantial stone wall. The situation of the meeting-house, which is a striking object in the view as the traveller approaches Glenarm, is most picturesque, but I cannot say that the building itself has any architectural recommendations. Not many years ago the meeting-house green began to be used as a burying ground. It is already tolerably well filled with graves. The reader is referred back to the year 1762, when the present meeting-house was built, for an account of the circumstances connected with this congregational property.

With regard to CONGREGATIONAL FUNDS, I have never heard of any legacies, either for charitable or congregational purposes, being bequeathed to the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm, nor of the congregation or minister enjoying any permanent endowment from any source whatever. Messrs. Smyth and Jellie, during their incumbencies in Glenarm, collected, in England and elsewhere, several sums of money for the purpose of building a manse for the minister of Glenarm. Afterwards additions were made to these sums, and the Glenarm Manse Fund now amounts to £242; but, as a suitable site for a manse could not be procured, the idea of erecting such a building has for the present been abandoned, and the money has been invested, on good and sufficient security, in the joint names of Mr. Callwell and myself, as trustees for the Glenarm Congregation. By order of the committee of the congregation, the annual interest arising from this fund goes to increase the small stipend of the minister, who, on his part, generously gives a portion of it to pay a Precentor.

If any RECORDS exist connected with the Old Presby-

terian Congregation of Glenarm, I have not been able to discover them, although I have inquired most diligently after them in every quarter where I thought they were likely to be found. I fear there are now no congregational records in existence, at least none deserving of the name. Some few registers of marriages and baptisms may still be preserved, but I am sure that these are very far indeed from being complete.

CLASSON PORTER.

LARNE, *December* 12, 1866.

[NOTE.—The foregoing paper, which concludes the history of the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Glenarm, also concludes what I have to say respecting one of the two groups of congregations whose memoirs I proposed writing in *The Christian Unitarian*. The group, which is now completed, has comprised the Old Presbyterian Congregations of Broadisland (or Ballycarry), Larne and Kilwaughter, Raloo, Cairncastle, and Glenarm, all of which are in my own immediate neighbourhood. To these I had intended adding another and more distant group, which was to have consisted of the Old Presbyterian Congregations of Antrim, Templepatrick, Crumlin, and Ballyclare. For the history of this second group I have been able, through the kindness of friends and my own researches, to collect a considerable quantity of materials. But as the work, although, according to my original plan, only half finished, has already swollen under my hands equally beyond reason and expectation, and as I feel that I have too long occupied much more than my due share of space in the pages of a small monthly publication, I think I shall consult the wishes of the great majority of the readers of *The Christian Unitarian* by now bringing my old-fashioned memoirs to a close. In doing so, I must thank the Editor for the patience with which, for no less than four years, he has endured my contributions, and also ask pardon of his subscribers for having so long obtruded myself upon their notice. The pleasure which a few readers, of kindred spirit to my own, have been so good as to say that they have derived from reading my papers, amply repays me for any trouble I may have had in connexion with a "labour of love," which (not without some feelings of regret) I now conclude.—C. P.]

THE LOVE OF THE FATHER IN THE GIFT OF THE SON.

The Apostle John, in his First Epistle, says—"In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." There is a fulness of meaning in these inspired words which no poor efforts of ours will ever be able fully to exhaust. But we may stand upon the edge of them, and look down into their clear, untroubled depths, and see there reflected an image of the eternal truth of God. Let me try, with such words as I may be able to command, to spread out before you two or three thoughts suggested by this utterance of the mind of God to his children—an utterance which has come to us through John, as a medium, but which had its source in nothing short of that eternal Spirit of God, without whose teachings man, at his best estate, is ignorant, and can but "stumble upon the dark mountains" of error.

It ought, I think, to be laid down upon the very threshold of this subject, that as love alone can understand love, so only those in whose hearts the love of God is a vital fact, can in any degree understand the words of the apostle. "The natural man," or man considered as to his intellectual nature merely, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." Our only hope, therefore, of catching a real glimpse, however slight, of the meanings hidden beneath these words lies in our having some experimental knowledge of God's love, not merely as an outward fact, but as a realized blessing in our own souls. God's love, like everything else which essentially inheres in him, must have existed from all eternity. What he now is in himself he must always have been, because, so far as the principles of his being are concerned, "he is without variableness or shadow of turning." But although the love of God is and must be an eternal fact, it can be appreciable by us, and available to us, only as it is manifested. That which is to

us an unknown thing is all the same as though it were not. But all love seeks, from its very nature, to manifest itself, because it is an active, and not a passive principle of being. Love, whether the direction it takes be good or evil, right or wrong, struggles to go out of itself, and fix itself upon some object external to the being which it rules. I should say, therefore, that the manifestation of God's love, considered as an object in the Divine mind, must have been as eternal as the love itself. In accordance with this idea we find such statements in the Scriptures as the following:—"Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee"—(Jeremiah xxxi. 3). "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord"—(Eph. iii. 11). "Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times"—(1 Pet. i. 20.)

Undoubtedly the love of God has been manifesting itself in varied forms ever since there were any objects upon which to fix itself. But the text leads us to a special and the greatest manifestation of that love—namely, the sending of Christ into the world. And it is beautiful to notice how, throughout the pages of the New Testament, the gift of the Son is so frequently spoken of as a token, and the very highest, of God's love towards man. Our Lord himself, when he told Nicodemus that "God loved the world," said that he "so loved it as to give his only begotten Son" for it. The Apostle Paul, too, in his Epistle to the Romans, consoles the Christians of that day by the consideration of the self-sacrifice made by the Father in giving the Son for the redemption of the world, for he says—"He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things." To the same purport is another statement which we find in the same Epistle, and which tells us that "God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." And when the apostle, in writing to the Corinthian Church, endeavours to stir up the benevolent feelings of its members towards the poor disciples in Judea, he bursts out into the exclamation, "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift," words which, as it seems to me, find their only and fitting meaning by being referred to him, who is, indeed, the

greatest and best of all the gifts which the Father has made to his children.

The gift of the Son is a peculiar and most impressive manifestation of the love of the Father. But that gift, that manifestation, had a purpose in it. Christ was given to the world by God, that the world through living sympathy with Christ might live; in other words, might have, in all its fulness, spiritual life, which, after all, is the only true, the only abiding life. This gift of God to the world was made, that the world, through Christ, might receive a divine assurance of God's perfect willingness to forgive his erring, wandering, and guilty children, an assurance which no man was ever yet able to find in the teachings of his own nature, or the manifold revelations of God in the external world. There was another object, too, to be served. God designed, by this gift of his Son, to put it within the reach of his children to have fellowship with Himself, in a larger measure, in an intenser form than they could otherwise realize it. And, as a matter of fact, the words of Paul and Peter have been verified in millions of cases since they were first of all written: "Through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father." "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." This He has done in every case in which the human soul has given itself up to the divine leadings of its divinely anointed Saviour.

The preciousness of this gift of God in the form of his Son, was an unsolicited one, and certainly undeserved. Herein is love, not that we loved God but that He loved us." It is true now, and ever has been, that it is "by grace we are saved, through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works lest any man should boast." While we were thoughtless about God, God was thoughtful about us; while we were alienating our hearts from Him by wicked works, He was always going after us, and drawing nigh to us that He might redeem us; until at last, in order to put the reality and depth of his love beyond the possibility of reasonable suspicion, He gave, what to Him was the greatest treasure He had in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, He gave One who was "the brightness of his glory and

the express image of his character," to seek and to save poor lost sinners, and thus gladden the heart of the universal Father, who must delight in the highest good of all his intelligent offspring.

Now if the Son of God be the gift of the Father, and if that gift is to be received as a manifestation of the Father's love, then Christ is to be looked upon as the outward and visible manifestation of the inward and invisible love of the heart of God. There is also this other truth to which the Apostle John refers. God's love towards us should be a motive constantly impelling us to manifest love towards our brethren. "Beloved, if God so loved us we ought also to love one another." Yes, we ought. It is the very least return we can make to Him whose love has been shown in so manifest a manner. At the same time, I have a deep and ever present conviction that nothing short of the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord will ever be sufficient to create, nourish, and send forth into the world pure and practical love for man as man. There may lie, here and there, fine natures touched with an excess of benevolent feeling, and freely imparting their stores to others; but take man as man the world over, and only as he realizes the love of God, and especially that manifestation of it which He has given in his Son, will man's love for man be spontaneous, pure, constant, deep, and unconquerable. The philanthropy which is to last and do thorough work in the world, must find its hidden springs in the manger of Bethlehem, the garden of Gethsemane, the hill of Calvary, the empty tomb in Joseph's garden, and the Christ who, having overcome, has sat down on his throne, and now sways his sceptre over millions of redeemed spirits.

FREDERICK ROWLAND YOUNG.
NEW SWINDON, WILTSHIRE.

THE FAMILY AT BETHANY.

A SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSON.—No. 9.

THIS family consisted of three individuals, a brother and his two sisters, who, we may suppose, were all unmarried, and who appear also to have been persons of some pro-

perty and consideration in their native town of Bethany. How our Lord became acquainted with them we are not told, unless the passage we find in the tenth chapter of Luke's gospel gives indication of a first acquaintance, where it is said that Jesus, with his disciples, "entered into a certain village, and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house." Be that as it may, we know from the beloved apostle that "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus." They must have been pious, upright, consistent, and, above all, very amiable people—those who feared God, and who endeavoured to walk in all his ordinances blameless—whose hearts were good and pure, and who, in their daily lives, adorned the doctrine they professed. It would seem that Martha was the housekeeper, the mistress and director of all the domestic concerns. Mary was most likely the younger sister, who shared with Martha in home duties, but had not so much responsibility resting on her. We do not know what was the calling of their brother Lazarus, but we may be assured he had some calling in life, for Jewish parents, even the richest of them, were particularly careful to have their sons taught some particular profession or trade—showing in this great wisdom, as not knowing what might befall them in after-life. Our Saviour himself worked as a carpenter, all his apostles were men of business, and we know that Paul laboured with his hands as a tent-maker.

The account given by St. Luke of the evening spent with the family at Bethany is very interesting, and may be made very profitable to us. We see there is a diversity of gifts, though the same spirit. Martha and Mary are most excellent women, sincerely desirous to fear God and to keep his commandments, but their views and their tempers are widely different. Martha is active and a little fussy. She is very grateful for our Lord's condescension in choosing to stay at her house, and she racks her brains to find the best way to bid him welcome. Nothing is too good for him—perhaps there is hardly anything good enough. She loads the table with provisions—they must be of the best quality and in great profusion. She is "cumbered about much serving," has no leisure for anything, save to serve up the feast at the due time, and in

the best order. Mary is quieter and more self-possessed. She had heard of Jesus, and of the sweet words he had spoken elsewhere, and now he is present with her in her own house, and she can now hear him herself, and can catch the gracious accents as they fall. She will not miss the present opportunity—it may never again occur. She sits reverentially, with awe, yet with humble confidence, at the feet of her blessed instructor, and minutes, hours, glide uncounted by, and the affairs of the world are quite forgotten, as the words of him who spake as never man spake drop on her ears;—her whole soul is bent on him and the truths he delivers. Well did that good old minister remark to his younger friend, "Christ once preached an excellent sermon to one woman." But Martha, whose present thoughts were more of earth, rather pettishly interposed, and wanted Mary to assist her in the entertainment, appealing, in a not-pleased tone, to our Lord himself—"Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone; bid her, therefore, that she help me." But Jesus, whose meat and drink it was to do the Father's will, remarks gravely, but very kindly, that Martha was too much troubled about things which were of little comparative importance. There was but one thing that was really needful, which thing Mary had most wisely chosen—the good part, which none could take from her. The rebuke was gentle, but, no doubt, most effectual. And it is addressed to all of us. The one thing needful is too often neglected or forgotten. Like Martha, what our hand findeth to do, we must do with our might, but heaven must have our chief thoughts. So, like Mary, may we sit at the feet of him through whom alone we come to God, and listen to his word, and humbly submit to be taught by him, that the end may be everlasting life.

But Lazarus—loved by his family, loved by the Saviour—falls sick, and dies. Jesus, who had other purposes in view concerning him, does not go to Lazarus in his illness, though earnestly solicited to come and heal him. The glory of God must be manifested in a way different from that which the sisters and the disciples expected and earnestly desired. It was not till he knew that Lazarus was really dead that our Lord proposed to his apostles to

go to Bethany, that he might waken him from his sleep. How touching, how soothing is the expression! And so he leaves the place where he was dwelling in security, on the far side of the Jordan, and once more comes among his enemies in Judea on the errand of mercy, to raise from the grave, and to give back to his fond sisters, the brother who had been taken from them, that this family might be once more united in love, and might be for a few years longer helpers of each other's joy on earth.

When Jesus came to Bethany, Lazarus had been dead four days: he was lying in the tomb, and the body had already begun to decay. But with God all things are possible, and so the raising of Lazarus to life again was within the bounds of Almighty power. The history, you will perceive, is very full and minute here, and its truth is apparent throughout. We see the anguish of the sisters, so characteristic of each. Mary silently weeps, and alone. She sits still in the house, or, to relieve her heart, she goes to the grave to weep there. Martha, with more activity of mind and body, comes and meets Jesus on the way. It is to be observed that both of the sisters utter precisely the same words—"Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." Such was their faith in his will and ability to save Lazarus. Jesus is greatly affected, he groans in spirit, he deeply sympathizes with the mourners but he assures Martha that her brother shall rise again, and then declares himself to be the resurrection and the life—a truth inconceivably grand as well as consoling. He goes onward to the tomb, a great multitude following him, and, in their presence, after a short prayer to his God and Father, he utters, with a voice which must be obeyed, the well-known words, "Lazarus, come forth," and "he that was dead came forth," bound in the grave-clothes, yet in life and in health; and, whilst all around must have been held in the most awful suspense, scarcely believing their eyes or ears, or knowing where they were, our Lord, calm as when he rebuked the stormy waves, and with the utmost dignity, bids that the man just called from the grave be loosed, and let go—that the swathings be taken from his limbs, that he may once more feel them and rejoice in his recovered being. It was for this—to

give the world another most convincing proof that he was the Messiah—that Lazarus was suffered to die, and then to be called back to life. It was a great miracle, and many who saw it believed on him. We must believe on him as the Christ of God, own him to be our Master, and make his Gospel the rule of our lives. Jesus, who called Lazarus to life, was himself raised to life by God, even the Father. So let us die to sin, that we may live the life of the Son of God, and rejoice in him with joy unspeakable. B.

THE RECENT AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

We published last month as ample a report as our space would permit of the important Conference of Unitarians recently held at Syracuse, N.Y. Both this meeting and that which was held last year in New York indicate a zeal and liberality among the Unitarian Christians of America which it is very refreshing to observe; and we doubt not that the earnestness manifested at these assemblies will be employed in gradually disseminating enlightened and sanctifying views of Christian truth through the entire extent of that vast and interesting country. It will have been remarked that, in America, as in these countries, there are two schools of Unitarians, one of which is impatient of everything that savours of definiteness in theology—a rule in ecclesiastical matters. At the New York Convention, held in the Autumn of last year, some objected to the designation "Lord" being applied to Jesus Christ; and one person most irreverently alleged that the term translated "Lord" and prefixed to Jesus, in our authorized version, was only equivalent to our term of respect, "*Mr.*" . . We wonder if those who object to the term "the Lord Jesus Christ" being embodied in the constitution of the American Unitarian Church profess to accept the Scriptures as their rule of faith. Very possibly they do. This year the same objection was raised. The Rev. F. E. Abbott, who spoke for others as well as for himself, objected to the expressions "the *Lord* Jesus Christ" and "the kingdom of *his Son*" being retained in the constitution of the Conference, and argued against these

expressions as virtually containing a creed. Much time was spent in discussing the question thus raised; but ultimately, after Dr. Bellows and others had spoken strongly in favour of retaining the terms objected to, and had intimated that, if the Christian standard which they had raised should now be lowered, they would be compelled to secede, Mr. Abbott's amendment was rejected by a large majority. The Rev. Mr. Mayo, speaking on the question, happily said—"He would be ashamed to go back and tell his people that all this Conference had done was to give up calling Jesus 'Lord.' People require personal leaders, and, in the great march and progress of improvement in this Western world, in the terrible conflict with the vices and sins of this age, no less commanding and august a person than Jesus Christ will satisfy them." We understand that Mr. Abbott and those who sympathized with him have withdrawn from the Conference. If they could not conscientiously remain, they were right to withdraw; nor should men be blamed, but rather, on the contrary, commended for obeying conscience: but it would have been a sad calamity if the Church which once numbered Channing and Ware among its most honoured teachers had consented, for sake of a broader basis, to put aside the Lord Jesus Christ.

It is instructive to observe how these proceedings are regarded by Unitarians in these countries. That the vast majority of the Unitarian laity read the result of the discussion with unmingled satisfaction, we are quite sure, for it is a fact worth noting, that even in congregations presided over by very "advanced" ministers, there is a prevailing sentiment among the people of hearty Christian faith; but we find that *The Unitarian Herald* takes the side of Mr. Abbott and his friends, and mourns over the decision which the Conference adopted. Before the editorial management of that journal was altered, towards the end of last year, we would not have been surprised to find a leading article advocating Mr. Abbott's views; for passages more offensive to Christian faith had once and again disfigured its columns, and given much pain to some of its best friends; but latterly, *The Herald* has written in a more reverent spirit. We were therefore surprised to find a leader, in one of the later

numbers, on the American Conference, which thus begins :—

"Our friends in the United States have come very near doing a great thing, but they have not done it, only succeeding, instead, in doing a small thing, though doing that remarkably well. They have just organised their scattered churches into one great body. It was open to them to do so on the basis of thorough Christian liberty. It would have been a great thing to have done this. It would have been taking up for their churches the broad, open position on which the church universal really stands. To have taken up, in their hour of revived religious zeal, when temptations to sectarian action are always strongest, this ultimate position, and to have shown the world that perfect liberty is not incompatible with heartiest union and most fervent zeal, would have been indeed a noble work. But they drew back a little from this. Only a little it is true. It is very little sectarianism they have retained; it is a very little creed they have set up, not enough to do much harm or any good. But still they did hold back. They might have been the one perfectly open Christian church in America, admitting all who would into their fellowship; they are now only the broadest and freest of the churches founded on a creed. For, take it how you will, their preamble *is* a creed. That preamble, adopted at the national convention of last year, ran thus:—

"'Whereas, the great opportunities and demands for Christian labour and consecration at this time increase our sense of the obligations of all disciples of *the Lord Jesus Christ* to prove their faith by self-denial, and by the devotion of their lives and possessions to the service of God and the building up of the *kingdom of His son.*'"

Here we see plainly what some English Unitarians understand by a free church. It must be independent not only of other churches, and of the State, but, also, of the LORD JESUS CHRIST! We suppose that is the view entertained by the congregation recently organized at Leicester, for we perceive that their church is based on *a belief in God the Father, and in man our brother;* and such seems to be the free organization for which *The Unitarian Herald* pleads. Considering the wild and rapid progress which, under the disgraced name of Unitarianism, some have lately made towards unbelief, we are reasonably led to inquire, can they go farther? We think they can. If to make a belief in the Lord Jesus Christ the basis of a church be to introduce a creed,—the thin end of the wedge, as our Presbytery of Antrim friends would say,—then is it not also imposing a creed, to do as the liberals at Leicester have done,—base the church on a belief in one God, the Father! It is a hard and unreasonable thing,

some may say, to bind all the members to a belief in the Fatherhood of God. Certainly, as the word "creed" is used now-a-days, such a belief *is* a creed; and some men, we know, do not like even a little creed.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIAN FESTIVAL AT TORONTO, C.W.

On Wednesday, November 21, the Unitarians of Toronto held their annual festival in the basement of their place of worship in Jarvis Street. Although the evening was most unfavourable there were some 300 persons present, many of whom belonged to other denominations. The room was decorated with evergreens, flowers, &c., for the occasion; and about eight o'clock the festival opened with a pleasant, social tea-drinking—many of the young persons of both sexes making themselves useful by attending to the wants of those present.

About nine o'clock, the tables having been cleared away, Dr. Benjamin Workman took the chair, and spoke briefly. Their church, he said, was now of age, as it was 21 years since that congregation was organised. The Doctor, alluding to Unitarians, observed that they were exponents of a religion of love and not of terror; and hence they could enjoy public worship better in their own sanctuary than in any of the neighbouring churches around them. He hoped the time would come when all mankind would divest the Heavenly Father of terrors. He looked on the Saviour solely as the great Teacher of all love, holiness and purity. In conclusion, he remarked that he was glad to see, by the number assembled from other churches, that a greater degree of Christian charity was prevalent.

The choir then sung the anthem, "I will extol Thee, O God."

The pastor of the church, the Rev. J. R. Lavelle, next delivered an address. The presence there of numbers of other Christians, he claimed to be a bright indication of growing good feeling and fraternal intercourse between those who differed widely in opinion. If, he continued, my Presbyterian brother believes in the deity of Christ, and in the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, that is no reason I should persecute him, or look askance at him in the street, or deny him the amenities of life. If my Methodist friend, in the exercise of the same Protestant right of private judgment, believes in no change after death, but that the state of each one at death is fixed as fate for the endless future, there is nothing that will justify me in persecuting him, and withholding from him Christian sociability and the kind sympathies of our nature. Neither should they, on the other hand, not only withdraw Christian intercourse, but stigmatize Unitarian Christians as infidels and deniers of Christ, simply because, in the exercise of that same Protestant right of

private judgment in reading the Scriptures, we discover in them the truth that God is one indivisible being, whose nature is love, and whose attributes all flow from and must partake of this nature; that Jesus Christ is *His Son*, and therefore a distinct and subordinate being; that the Holy Ghost is the spirit of God; that all punishment under the Divine government must, of necessity, be disciplinary, and that this supreme Father of all never changes. He then went on to argue, that of late there was more toleration shown by Christians to one another, and that a better era had begun to dawn.

The remainder of the entertainment consisted of musical selections, sung, generally, with much taste.

The National Anthem, in which all joined, closed the festival.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE UNITARIAN CHURCH, ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

The eleventh annual meeting of this church was held on Friday evening, October 26, J. Howard Clark, Esq., J.P., in the chair. The report submitted was of a satisfactory nature: it stated that the Sunday-school was flourishing, that a Young Men's and Young Women's Improvement Society had been formed, that the Children's Library was giving much satisfaction, and that a Church Library had been formed, the congregation being indebted for many valuable books to the kindness of the Rev. J. Scott Porter, of Belfast, and many personal friends of the Rev. J. C. Woods, both in Ireland and England. A resolution, embodying thanks to the minister for his services, having been carried unanimously, Mr. Woods, in his reply, paid a tribute of respect to the memory of the late Rev. Dr. Montgomery, his own friend and his father's friend. He spoke of him as a man of extraordinary natural ability, and of commanding eloquence, and as one of the greatest benefactors to the Unitarian Church. Some beautiful sacred music was performed in the course of the evening, and a pleasant and profitable meeting was closed with a prayer by the minister.

SCOTTISH UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The anniversary sermons of the Scottish Unitarian Association were preached in the Unitarian Church, Glasgow, on Sunday, November 18th, by the Rev. Charles Beard. The attendance at both services was very large. The next day the business meeting was held, Ivie Mackie, Esq., presiding. The Rev. H. W. Crosskey read the report of the Committee for the past year. It gave a favourable account of the Missionary labours in Aberdeen, Dundee, Montrose, Stonehaven, and Greenock. At Paisley, where so faithful a congregation bears witness to the great principles of the Unitarian faith, Mr. Crosskey had conducted services in behalf of the Association. The Treasurer's report showed a balance in favour of the Association of about £140.

The reports were unanimously adopted; and officers appointed for the ensuing year; Ivie Mackie, Esq., being chosen president. Thanks were voted to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association

for the liberal grant in aid of Missionary work; and Rev. J. C. Street expressed the sympathy of the Northumberland and Durham Association, and described the work he was carrying on in his district. Mr. Briggs and Rev. H. Williamson spoke with reference to Dundee; Mr. Gregorson, to Greenock; and Rev. W. Sharman, to Aberdeen; and hearty thanks were voted to John Warren, Esq., the retiring Treasurer, and to the Chairman.

The Soiree was held the next evening in the Merchants' Hall, Ivie Mackie, Esq., in the chair. There was a numerous attendance, and among those on the platform were the Revs. C. Beard, H. W. Crosskey, R. B. Drummond, J. C. Street, A. Gordon, W. Sharman, H. Williamson, Mr. Parris (of the Brown Street Baptist Church, Glasgow); George Hope, Esq., and H. Briggs, Esq. The Rev. P. Callender, and a number of friends from Paisley, joined the assembly after tea.

The Chairman said: I have been requested to take the chair again this evening; and while I would rather have been excused, yet I am willing to render any small service I can to my good friends in Glasgow. I rejoice in the perfect liberty our ministers possess, a liberty that is not possessed by any other body. We have no creeds, and I hope we never shall have; but that every one will be allowed to think and judge for himself. We ask no questions of Christian men who join in worship with us, and in a spirit of Christian charity we invite them to join us at the communion table, leaving it to their own judgment to say whether they are fit for that ordinance, putting it upon them to examine themselves whether they are qualified for that sacred rite. Yet, although we really enjoy liberty which no other class of Christians possess, I believe there is more unanimity in our opinions than is found among those parties who bind their members to a given creed, for it is impossible to gag the mind of man. You might as well try to make us all of one stature as all of one opinion—a truism you will admit. There is one topic, on which I wish to say a few words, that has been brought before us in Manchester more than once. There is a saying that "a fair day's work" should receive "a fair day's wage." There have been a good many strikes of late, and I am often astonished that our respected ministers do not strike. Every one in business seems to go on prospering; we all accumulate wealth; but we have a kind of idea that clergymen should remain in the same position which they held ten or twenty years ago. Now, having made money in England, I intend to live half my time at least in Scotland; and so I shall be more among you than heretofore. You have got an excellent minister—in fact, I don't know a better anywhere in the body—and in Manchester we propose to raise our ministers' salaries one-third more than they are at present. I hope we shall get more than that here; and I am ready to become one of the contributors, for I feel ashamed at the mere pittance that many of our ministers get,—scarcely enough to keep soul and body together. A man comes among you with a young wife, perhaps, and in a few years his family increases, so that better provision is required for him. The apostle says, "He that does not provide for those of his own house has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel;" but how can a man provide for his family's wants if he

has not money enough? I hope you will keep this matter in view, and do something decided shortly.

The Rev. Mr. Sharman said that wherever he had gone in his missionary labours he had found a very attentive and intelligent audience prepared to hear him, and he believed that if their work was done on a wider field, they would reap yet a larger produce.

The Rev. H. Williamson gave a cheering account of the mission in Dundee, and believed that they were in a fair way of building up a congregation to carry on the great work in which they were embarked.

The Rev. A. Gordon spoke on "Free Christianity in Scotland," the Rev. C. Beard on "Free Christianity in England," the Rev. J. C. Street on "Our Missionary Work." The meeting was also addressed by Messrs. Parris, S. Hope, Briggs, and Brace, and by the Revs. B. B. Drummond, and H. W. Crosskey, and the proceedings closed with the benediction.

ADDRESS OF THE NON-SUBSCRIBING ASSOCIATION TO THE LORD LIEUTENANT.

On Tuesday, December 4, a deputation from the Association of Irish Non-Subscribing Presbyterians presented an address to the Lord Lieutenant, in which they said—"We, the committee of the Association of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland, comprising four ecclesiastical bodies, distinct in jurisdiction, but unanimous in adherence to the great principles of the reformation, viz., the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, the right of private judgment, and the rejection of human authority in all matters of faith, embrace the opportunity afforded by our first meeting since your Excellency's appointment as Lord Lieutenant, to tender to your Excellency, on our own behalf, and in the name of the churches which we represent, our humble and dutiful congratulation on your attainment of the high office to which you have been called by Her Most Gracious Majesty." The address thus refers to the subject of United Education,—"Viewing the training of youth on sound and equitable principles as tending powerfully to promote individual virtue, sound prosperity, and national liberty, we have peculiar pleasure in bearing our testimony to the beneficial tendency of the National System of Education, as originally introduced to Parliament by the statesman who is now at the head of Her Majesty's Government, and of the provision made for the higher education of youth in the Queen's Colleges and the Queen's University, as originally constituted. These systems appear to be as beneficial in their results as they were admirable in their conception; and we view with regret and alarm the inroads which have recently been made on their fundamental principles—those namely of united education for the youth of all denominations, non-interference with the peculiar tenets of any church, and freedom from ecclesiastical control. We hope and trust that your Excellency will discountenance and discourage all attempts to interfere with principles so equitable in themselves, and so admirably adapted to the state of this distracted country." His Excellency, in his reply to the address, said, "From your position as ministers of the gospel you

have especial advantages in estimating the results of education in this country, and the opinions you express are, therefore, the more valuable. It is a subject to which too much importance cannot be attached, for on the impressions received in early years must, in a great measure, depend the future conduct of all classes; and it must be the wish of all to whom the social condition of this country is a matter of interest, as it will be the unremitting object of the government, that its benefits should be as widely diffused, and rendered as extensively available as possible."

We learn from the *Scotsman* that the question of a revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith was made the subject of some remarks by the Rev. Dr. Edmond, at the late meeting of the United Presbyterian Presbytery of London. Dr. Edmond, besides advocating revision, referred to the terms or meaning of subscription, saying that, "if the acceptance of these bulky documents is to be regarded as an acceptance of the correctness of every proposition in them, there will be very few of us who would now subscribe them, or who would be willing to be so bound."

The Rev. A. Lunn, of Newtownlimavady, has accepted an invitation to become the minister of the General Baptist Church, Hammond Hill, Chatham, and will enter on his duties early in January.

We understand that the Rev. William Binns has resigned the pulpit of the Unitarian Church, Birkenhead.

The Free Church recently opened in Leicester, under the pastoral charge of the Rev. W. Mitchell, formerly minister of the Unitarian Church, Crewe, is founded on "the belief in God, our Father, and man, our brother." This church is evidently Unitarian, as it is founded in a belief in one God, the Father; whether it is Christian or not its foundation principles, as published, afford us no means of determining.

OBITUARY.

Died, in London, on November 23, Mr. Robert Alexander Hodgson, formerly of Belfast, aged 58 years.

Died, in Stanhope Street, Belfast, on December 5, Emily, fourth daughter of the Rev. T. Bowring, in her eighteenth year.

Died, at Marino, Holywood, on December 21, Julia, wife of Mr. John A. Hanna, and youngest daughter of Mr. William Spackman, Belfast.

Died, on December 12, at Kilwaughter, near Larne, Mary Nelson, wife of Mr. Thomas Magill, aged 56 years.

Died, on December 22, at Cairncastle, near Larne, Mr. Hugh Bailey, aged 75 years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 59, Upper Arthur Street, Belfast.

GTU Library
3 2400 00269 2816